

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO
3
4 In Re:) Docket No. 3:17-BK-3283 (LTS)
5)
6) PROMESA Title III
7 The Financial Oversight and)
8 Management Board for)
9 Puerto Rico,) (Jointly Administered)
10)
11 *as representative of*)
12)
13 The Commonwealth of)
14 Puerto Rico, *et al.*) February 17, 2022
15)
16 Debtors,)
17
18
19 FURTHER HEARING ON ADJOURNED OMNIBUS OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS
20 BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
22 AND THE HONORABLE U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE JUDITH GAIL DEIN
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182
2183
2184
2185
2186
2187
2188
2189
2190
2191
21

1 APPEARANCES, Continued:

2 For Luciano Silva

3 Rivera: Mr. Luciano Silva Rivera, Pro Se

4 For William Maldonado
5 Morales:

Mr. William Maldonado Morales, Pro Se

6 ALSO PRESENT:

7 Mr. Jose Luis Rosado Santiago, Interpreter

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings recorded by stenography. Transcript produced by
CAT.

I N D E X

WITNESSES:

PAGE

None offered.

EXHIBITS:

None offered.

1 San Juan, Puerto Rico

2 February 17, 2022

3 At or about 9:32 AM

4 * * *

5 THE COURT: Buenos dias. I am Judge Swain.

6 Would the courtroom deputy please announce the case?

7 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Good morning, Your Honor.

8 The United States District Court for the District of
9 Puerto Rico is now in session. The Honorable Laura Taylor
10 Swain presiding. Also present, the Honorable Magistrate Judge
11 Judith Gail Dein. God save the United States of America and
12 this Honorable Court.

13 *In re: The Financial Oversight and Management Board*
14 *for Puerto Rico, as representative of the Commonwealth of*
15 *Puerto Rico, et al.,* PROMESA, Title III, case no. 2017-3283,
16 for Further Hearing on Omnibus Objections to Claims.

17 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Tacoronte. Is a
18 Spanish-English interpreter present in the courtroom?

19 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes, Your Honor. His name is Jose
20 Luis Rosado.

21 THE COURT: Thank you.

22 Good morning, Mr. Rosado. Are you a certified
23 interpreter?

24 THE INTERPRETER: No, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Ms. Tacoronte, would you please

1 administer the oath?

2 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Will do, Your Honor.

3 Please raise your right hand.

4 You do solemnly swear that you will justly, truly,
5 fairly, and impartially act as an interpreter in the case now
6 before the Court?

7 THE INTERPRETER: I do.

8 COURTROOM DEPUTY: So help you God.

9 THE COURT: Ms. Tacoronte, does the interpreter need
10 to repeat the last phrase?

11 THE INTERPRETER: I do.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 So now, counsel, please turn your cameras on for
14 these introductory remarks and instructions, and keep your
15 microphones muted.

16 Welcome, counsel, parties in interest, and members of
17 the public, and press. The hearing this morning is solely for
18 the purpose of addressing several pending Omnibus Claims
19 Objections concerning the claims of pro se creditors, which we
20 are simultaneously conducting remotely with our courtroom in
21 San Juan for pro se participants, and on the Zoom platform for
22 counsel and for the Court. A listen-only line is also
23 available through AT&T.

24 If you are not attending for the purpose of the Claim
25 Objection Hearing, you may log out of the virtual hearing at

1 any time. The next Omnibus Hearing in these Title III cases
2 is scheduled for March 23rd, 2022.

3 To ensure the orderly operation of today's hearing,
4 once we turn to our Agenda items, all parties appearing by
5 Zoom must mute their microphones when they're not speaking,
6 and turn off their video cameras if they are not directly
7 involved in the presentation or argument. When you need to
8 speak, turn your camera on, and unmute your microphone on the
9 Zoom screen.

10 I remind everyone that, consistent with court and
11 judicial conference policies and the orders that have been
12 issued, no recording or retransmission of the hearing is
13 permitted by anyone, including but not limited to the parties,
14 members of the public, and the press. Violations of this rule
15 may be punished with sanctions.

16 I will be calling on each speaker during the hearing.
17 When your name is called, if you are in the courthouse, please
18 approach the podium and identify yourself by name for clarity
19 of the record. If you are participating by Zoom, when you're
20 called upon, please turn your camera on, unmute yourself, and
21 identify yourself by name for clarity of the record. As has
22 been demonstrated with the swearing in of the interpreter, we
23 have ensured that interpretation services are available for
24 any speaker who needs Spanish-English interpretation.

25 After the speakers listed on the Agenda for each of

1 today's matters have spoken, I may permit other counsel to
2 address briefly any issues raised during the presentations
3 that require further remarks. If you wish to be heard under
4 these circumstances, or feel that you need to make a comment
5 in connection with an Agenda matter, and you are appearing by
6 Zoom, please use the "raise hand" feature at the appropriate
7 time. That can be accessed through the reactions icon in the
8 tool bar located at the bottom of the Zoom screen. I will
9 call on any speakers one by one. Please use the "lower hand"
10 feature after you have finished speaking.

11 Please don't interrupt each other or me during the
12 hearing. If we interrupt each other, it's difficult to create
13 an accurate transcript of the proceeding, but having said
14 that, I apologize in advance for breaking the rule, because I
15 may interrupt if I have questions or if you go beyond your
16 allotted time. If anyone has any difficulty hearing me or
17 another participant, please use the "raise hand" feature
18 immediately.

19 The Agenda was filed as docket entry no. 20125 in
20 case no. 17-3283, and it is available to the public at no cost
21 on Prime Clerk for those who are interested. I encourage each
22 speaker to keep track of his or her own time. The Court will
23 also keep track of the time, and will alert each speaker when
24 there are three minutes remaining with one buzz, and, when
25 time is up, with two buzzes. Here is an example of the buzzer

1 sound.

2 (Sound played.)

3 THE COURT: If your allocation is three minutes or
4 less, you will just hear the final two buzzes.

5 If we need to take a break, all persons who are
6 listening in on the AT&T telephone dial-in line should not
7 hang up, but, instead, keep their lines on hold or open until
8 the time for resumption of the hearing. This morning the
9 hearing will continue until 1:30 PM Atlantic Standard Time,
10 which is 12:30 PM Eastern Standard Time, with a break at some
11 point in the morning proceeding; and, if necessary, the
12 hearing will resume at 2:15 Atlantic Standard Time, which is
13 1:15 Eastern Standard Time.

14 So I would ask that those of you who are
15 participating by Zoom turn your cameras off now, and turn your
16 camera back on when called upon for your Agenda item. I will
17 hear the claim objections pertaining to claimants who have
18 arrived at the courthouse in San Juan to participate in
19 today's hearing first, and then go back to other items as
20 necessary. Periodically -- well, I have requested that the
21 courtroom deputy let me and my staff know directly whether and
22 when additional claimants appear in the courtroom, so that
23 their claim or claims can be addressed promptly.

24 Ms. Tacoronte, are there any claimants present in the
25 courtroom at this point?

1 COURTROOM DEPUTY: No, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: Thank you.

3 Then we will begin with Agenda section IV, and we
4 will start with the first contested claim objection. Would
5 counsel for the Oversight Board please turn on her camera?

6 MS. STAFFORD: Good morning, Your Honor. Laura
7 Stafford --

8 THE COURT: Good morning.

9 MS. STAFFORD: I'm sorry. Laura Stafford of
10 Proskauer Rose on behalf of the Oversight Board.

11 THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Stafford.

12 The first Agenda item, IV.1, is the 370th Omnibus
13 Objection, and, specifically, the response of Zobeida
14 Medina-Serrano to that objection. There is also, for
15 Ms. Medina-Serrano, a response to an objection, to the 374th
16 Omnibus Objection.

17 Ms. Stafford, would you please proceed?

18 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 The 374th Objection is filed at ECF no. 17923, and it
20 seeks to disallow proofs of claim filed after the bar dates
21 established by this Court's bar date orders, which, for the
22 Commonwealth, COFINA, HTA, ERS, and PREPA is June 29th of
23 2018, and for PBA, is July 29th of 2020.

24 Pursuant to the terms of the bar date orders, if a
25 claimant failed to file a proof of claim on or before the

1 applicable bar date, that claimant would be barred, estopped,
2 and enjoined from asserting that claim against the debtors,
3 and the debtors would be forever discharged from indebtedness
4 and liability with respect to such claim.

5 Ms. Medina-Serrano filed a response at ECF no. 18110
6 with respect to Proof of Claim Nos. 179428 and 179433. Both
7 of those claims were filed on June 25th of 2021, nearly three
8 years after the applicable bar date of June 29th, 2018. The
9 claims assert liabilities arising from allegedly accrued but
10 unpaid salary adjustments purportedly owed by the Department
11 of Education.

12 The response states that the claims were sent by mail
13 on June 11th, 2021, and that, during the pandemic, the Postal
14 Service has been delayed in delivering mail. The response
15 does not, however, explain why Medina-Serrano was unable to
16 file a timely proof of claim in 2018, or how Postal Service
17 delays in 2020 and 2021 may have prevented her from doing so.
18 Accordingly, because the response does not dispute the claim
19 was timely file -- that the claim was not timely filed, and
20 does not provide an explanation for the failure to timely file
21 the claim, we'd request the Court sustain the objection and
22 disallow the claims.

23 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

24 I have reviewed the submissions, and listened
25 carefully to your presentation. My ruling is as follows:

1 The 374th Omnibus Objection is sustained as to Claim Nos.
2 179428 and 179433 filed by Zobeida Medina-Serrano. Those
3 claims are disallowed in their entirety as untimely, because
4 they were filed nearly three years after the applicable bar
5 date, and no valid excuse or justification has been offered
6 for the late filing. Accordingly, claims 179428 and 179433
7 are disallowed.

8 In light of this ruling, Ms. Stafford, is it
9 necessary to address your objection in the 370th Omnibus
10 Objection?

11 MS. STAFFORD: No, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: So we will now turn to Agenda Item 2,
13 which also has to do with the 374th Omnibus Objection, and the
14 response of Roberto Berrios-Castrodad. Would you present the
15 objection, Ms. Stafford?

16 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 As noted, the response was filed by Roberto
18 Berrios-Castrodad with respect to the 374th Omnibus Objection.
19 The response is available at ECF no. 19037, and it addresses
20 Proof of Claim No. 179463. This claim was filed on July 26th
21 of 2021, over three years after the applicable bar date. The
22 claim asserts liabilities arising from Law 89 of 1979, a
23 statute relating to wage compensation.

24 The response does not address the debtors' contention
25 that the claim was not timely filed. Instead, it consists of

1 a copy of a Spanish language letter stating that
2 Mr. Berrios-Castrodad has been trying to obtain a copy of his
3 teacher's certificate, and is now sending it to the debtors as
4 proof of his request.

5 The Berrios-Castrodad response does not, therefore,
6 explain why Mr. Berrios-Castrodad was unable to file a timely
7 proof of claim, particularly given that he is attempting to
8 assert liabilities purportedly owed pursuant to a statute
9 passed in 1979. Accordingly, because the response does not
10 either dispute that the claim was not timely filed, and does
11 not provide an explanation for the failure to timely file a
12 proof of claim, we would request the Court sustain the
13 objection and disallow the claim.

14 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

15 I have reviewed the submissions on this and all of
16 the claims that we are hearing today, and listened carefully
17 to your presentation. My ruling is as follows: The 374th
18 Omnibus Objection is sustained as to Claim No. 179463 filed by
19 Roberto Berrios-Castrodad. That claim is disallowed in its
20 entirety as untimely, because it was filed more than three
21 years after the applicable bar date, and no valid excuse or
22 justification for the late filing has been presented.
23 Accordingly, claim 179463 is disallowed as untimely.

24 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: The next Agenda item is Agenda Item No.

1 3, which also has to do with the 374th Omnibus Objection, in
2 this instance, the response of Jaime A. Diaz-O'Neill to the
3 objection.

4 Ms. Stafford, would you please present?

5 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 As noted, these -- Mr. Diaz-O'Neill filed multiple
7 responses in response to the 374th Objection, and those
8 responses are available at ECF nos. 19125, 19142, 19 -- and
9 19507. Each of those responses addressed Proof of Claim No.
10 178975. That claim was filed on December 7th, 2020, about two
11 and a half years after the applicable bar date. The claim
12 asserts a hundred million dollars in liabilities purportedly
13 arising from alleged violations of Mr. Diaz-O'Neill's
14 constitutional rights, which were allegedly committed by the
15 Commonwealth, PRASA, and several other defendants.

16 The responses do not dispute that the claim was not
17 timely filed. Instead, Mr. Diaz-O'Neill contends that he has
18 been arrested on multiple occasions, which have prevented him
19 from filing a proof of claim, and impeded his access to due
20 process of law. In particular, the third Diaz-O'Neill
21 response alleges Mr. Diaz-O'Neill was arrested in Pooler,
22 Georgia, in June, 2018, and was released the next day.
23 Mr. Diaz-O'Neill further contends the arrest was the result of
24 a concerted criminal action in favor of certain of the
25 defendants he's identified, including the Commonwealth

1 Government.

2 The response, however, does not provide an adequate
3 explanation for Mr. Diaz-O'Neill's failure to timely file a
4 proof of claim. While Mr. Diaz-O'Neill demonstrates he was
5 arrested in June of 2018, he notes he was released from prison
6 within a day, and he does not explain why that arrest made him
7 unable to file a proof of claim either before or after his
8 arrest and within the time frame set by the Court. He also
9 does not explain the two-and-a-half-year delay after the bar
10 date, prior to the filing of his proof of claim. And for
11 those reasons, Your Honor, we'd request the Court sustain the
12 objection and disallow the claim, notwithstanding the
13 responses.

14 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford. I have one
15 question. Was the late filing one and a half years after the
16 bar date or two and a half years after the bar date?

17 MS. STAFFORD: It was in December of 2020, so I
18 believe two and a half years after the June 29th, 2018, bar
19 date, if I'm doing my math correctly, which I may not be.

20 THE COURT: That sounds right, but, in any event,
21 certainly well after the bar date.

22 MS. STAFFORD: Yes.

23 THE COURT: My calendar skills are not always
24 precisely sharp this early in the morning.

25 MS. STAFFORD: More than mine.

1 THE COURT: Thank you.

2 My ruling with respect to this claim is that the
3 374th Omnibus Objection is sustained as to Claim No. 178975
4 filed by Jaime A. Diaz-O'Neill. That claim is disallowed in
5 its entirety as untimely, because it was filed well after the
6 applicable bar date, and no valid excuse or justification for
7 the late filing has been presented. Therefore, Claim No.
8 178975 is disallowed in its entirety.

9 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: The next Agenda item is IV.4, also having
11 to do with the 374th Omnibus Objection. This Agenda item is
12 the response of Facunda Martinez-Colon to the 374th Omnibus
13 Objection.

14 Ms. Stafford?

15 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 Ms. Martinez-Colon filed a response on the docket at
17 ECF no. 18159, and this response addresses Proof of Claim No.
18 179193. This proof of claim was filed on April 17th, 2021,
19 just under three years after the applicable bar date. The
20 claim asserts liabilities arising from Ms. Martinez-Colon's
21 retirement contributions.

22 The Martinez-Colon response does not dispute that the
23 Martinez-Colon claim was not timely filed, and it does not
24 present any excuse for the failure -- or explanation for the
25 failure to file a timely proof of claim. Instead, it objects

1 to disallowance of the Martinez-Colon claim, because
2 Ms. Martinez-Colon believes she is entitled to her accumulated
3 retirement contributions.

4 Accordingly, because the response does not dispute
5 that the claim was not timely filed, and does not provide any
6 explanation for that failure to timely file a proof of claim,
7 we request the Court sustain the objection and disallow the
8 claim, notwithstanding the response.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 My ruling is as follows: The 374th Omnibus Objection
11 is sustained as to Claim No. 179193 filed by Facunda
12 Martinez-Colon. That claim is disallowed in its entirety as
13 untimely, because it was filed nearly three years after the
14 applicable bar date. Claim No. 179193 is disallowed.

15 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: The next Agenda item is number IV.5, the
17 response of Melvin Lynn Revocable Trust to the 374th Omnibus
18 Objection.

19 Ms. Stafford?

20 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 The Melvin Lynn Trust filed multiple responses to the
22 374th Omnibus Objection, which are available at ECF nos.
23 18139, 18377, and 20060. Each of these responses addressed
24 Proof of Claim No. 179204. That proof of claim was filed
25 against the Commonwealth on May 7th of 2021, nearly three

1 years after the Commonwealth bar date. It purports to assert
2 liabilities associated with GO Bonds, or General Obligations
3 Bonds, and bonds issued by the Puerto Rico Electric Power
4 Authority.

5 The bar date orders did not require parties to file
6 proofs of claim provided their claim is limited to the
7 repayment of principal, interest, and other amounts arising
8 from applicable trust agreements or bond documents. However,
9 to the extent a claimant sought to assert a claim for amounts
10 aside from repayment of principal and interest, such as a
11 claim for investment losses, claimants were required to file a
12 proof of claim.

13 Accordingly, while Mr. Lynn -- while the Lynn
14 Irrevocable Trust did not need to file claims to assert rights
15 to repayment of principal and interest on the bonds, it was
16 required to file a proof of claim to the extent it seeks to
17 assert any additional liabilities, such as liabilities
18 associated with investment losses.

19 The responses provide several explanations for the
20 delay in filing the claims. Principally, that Mr. Lynn has
21 suffered from health complications during the last several
22 years, which have, unfortunately, required him to spend time
23 at hospitals and rehab; that the mail may have gotten lost in
24 the Post office and been delivered late, or have been slow in
25 receipt, which Mr. Lynn contends has been common during COVID.

1 Neither explanation is sufficient to justify a delay
2 in filing a proof of claim, because although the debtors are
3 mindful of Mr. Lynn's health concerns, he does acknowledge
4 that he has been able to attend to most matters,
5 notwithstanding his ill health, and those concerns,
6 accordingly, do not explain the three-year delay in filing the
7 claims. Further, the mail delays which Mr. Lynn notes have
8 only been an issue since the disruptions arising during the
9 COVID pandemic, which did not arise until March of 2020, just
10 shy of two years after the Commonwealth's bar date.

11 Accordingly, to the extent Mr. Lynn seeks to assert
12 amounts beyond principal and interest, we would allege those
13 claims are late-filed and should be disallowed. We do not
14 seek to disallow Mr. Lynn's claims to the extent they seek
15 repayment of principal and interest on the General Obligation
16 Bonds or the PREPA Bonds. And with that limitation, Your
17 Honor, we'd request the Court sustain the objection and
18 disallow the claim to the extent it asserts more than
19 principal and interest, or amounts arising under the bond
20 documents.

21 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

22 My ruling is as follows: The 374th Omnibus Objection
23 is sustained as to Claim No. 179204 filed by the Melvin Lynn
24 Revocable Trust, and that claim is disallowed as late-filed to
25 the extent it asserts any claim beyond the repayment of

1 principal, interest, and other fees and expenses arising from
2 the bonds identified by the claimant. The objection is
3 overruled, however, to the extent it seeks the disallowance of
4 any claim for the repayment of principal, interest, and other
5 fees and expenses, because the debtors acknowledge that the
6 Bar Date Order does not apply to such claims.

7 Ms. Stafford, will you make clear in the order
8 dealing with the 374th Objection that there is this
9 distinction and only a partial disallowance?

10 MS. STAFFORD: We will do so, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Thank you.

12 The next Agenda item also arises in connection with
13 the 374th Omnibus Objection, and this Agenda item is the
14 response of Hermenegildo Rodriguez-Gonzalez to that objection.

15 Ms. Stafford.

16 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 This response was filed at ECF no. 18234 by, as the
18 Court noted, Hermenegildo Rodriguez-Gonzalez with respect to
19 Proof of Claim No. 179457. That proof of claim was filed on
20 July 20th, 2021, a little over three years after the
21 applicable bar date. The Rodriguez-Gonzalez claim asserts
22 liabilities arising from allegedly accrued but unpaid salary
23 adjustments.

24 The response does not dispute that the claim was not
25 timely filed. Instead, it objects to disallowance, because

1 Mr. Rodriguez-Gonzalez did not know where to file a claim.
2 That acknowledgment does not excuse the failure to file a
3 timely proof of claim, however, because the bar date notice
4 approved by the Court contained detailed instructions
5 regarding where and how to file a proof of claim.

6 Accordingly, because the response does not dispute
7 that the claim was not timely filed, and does not provide an
8 explanation for the failure to timely file a proof of claim,
9 the debtors would respectfully request the Court sustain the
10 objection and disallow the claim.

11 THE COURT: Ms. Stafford, were the instructions that
12 you just referred to provided in both English and Spanish?

13 MS. STAFFORD: They were, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Thank you.

15 My ruling is as follows: The 374th Omnibus Objection
16 is sustained as to Claim No. 179457 filed by Hermenegildo
17 Rodriguez-Gonzalez, and that claim is disallowed in its
18 entirety as untimely, because it was filed over three years
19 after the applicable bar date and no valid excuse or
20 justification has been presented for the late filing.

21 The next Agenda item is number IV.7, the response of
22 Celia Pilar Santiago-Ortiz to the 374th Omnibus Objection.

23 Ms. Stafford?

24 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

25 This response was mailed directly to the debtors, and

1 we filed it on the docket at ECF no. 19995-7, with a certified
2 translation available at 19995-8, and it addresses Proof of
3 Claim No. 179439. That proof of claim was filed on July 6th,
4 2021, again, about three years after the applicable bar date.
5 The claim asserts liabilities arising from purportedly --
6 allegedly accrued but unpaid salary increases owed by the
7 Puerto Rico Department of Education.

8 The response does not dispute that the claim was not
9 timely filed. Instead, it consists of a completed information
10 form reiterating that the claim asserts liabilities associated
11 with wage increases. Accordingly, because the response
12 neither disputes that the claim was timely file -- was not
13 timely filed and does not provide an explanation for the
14 failure to timely file such a proof of claim, the debtors
15 would respectfully request the Court sustain the objection and
16 disallow the claim.

17 THE COURT: Thank you.

18 My ruling is as follows: The 374th Omnibus Objection
19 is sustained as to Claim No. 179439 filed by Celia Pilar
20 Santiago-Ortiz. That claim is disallowed in its entirety as
21 untimely, because it was filed approximately three years after
22 the applicable bar date, and no valid excuse or justification
23 has been presented for the late filing. Claim 179439 is
24 disallowed as untimely.

25 The next Agenda item is the response of Myriam S.

1 Gandia to the 374th Omnibus Objection.

2 Ms. Stafford?

3 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 Myriam Gandia filed a response as ECF no. 18165.

5 That response addresses two claims, one subject to the 374th

6 Omnibus Objection, and one subject to the 381st Objection.

7 And we'll address the 374th Objection first per Your Honor's
8 request.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 MS. STAFFORD: The 374th Omnibus Objection sought to
11 disallow, among others, Proof of Claim No. 179447 on the basis
12 that it was not timely filed. Proof of Claim No. 179447 was
13 filed on July 14th, 2021, about three years after the
14 applicable bar date. It asserts liabilities that purportedly
15 arise from retirement contributions owed to Ms. Gandia
16 following her father's passing in 2002.

17 The response does not dispute that the claim was not
18 timely filed. Instead, it states that Ms. Gandia was in
19 Florida, and only learned of the deadline to file a proof of
20 claim in July of 2021, when she went to Puerto Rico. However,
21 the Bar Date Notice approved by the Court authorized
22 distribution of information regarding the bar date widely,
23 including in Florida. Accordingly, because the response does
24 not dispute that the claim was not timely filed and does not
25 provide an explanation for the failure to timely file a proof

1 of claim in respect of liabilities owed in relation to her --
2 to Mr. Gandia's passing in 2002, we'd request the Court
3 sustain the objection and disallow the claim, notwithstanding
4 the response.

5 THE COURT: Ms. Stafford, am I correct in
6 understanding that she had filed an earlier proof of claim on
7 behalf of her father before the July 2021 time frame?

8 MS. STAFFORD: I am not sure of that, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Very well then. I certainly did
10 authorize broad notice of the bar date, and so my ruling is as
11 follows: The 374th Omnibus Objection is sustained as to Claim
12 No. 179447 filed by Myriam S. Gandia, and that claim is
13 disallowed in its entirety as untimely, because it was filed
14 approximately three years after the applicable bar date and no
15 valid excuse or justification has been presented for the late
16 filing.

17 Now, in light of this ruling as to -- sorry, the
18 381st, does that have to do with the same claim or a different
19 claim?

20 MS. STAFFORD: It is a different claim.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. So we will go on to
22 the 381st.

23 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

24 The 381st Omnibus Objection, which was filed at ECF
25 no. 17917, sought to disallow proofs of claim asserting

1 liabilities against entities that are not Title III debtors,
2 but that failed to provide a basis for asserting such
3 liabilities against the Commonwealth or any other Title III
4 debtor. The response filed at ECF no. 18165 by Ms. Gandia
5 addresses also Proof of Claim No. 17375, which asserts
6 liabilities associated with wages purportedly owed by the
7 Puerto Rico Sugar Corporation. As set forth in the debtors'
8 reply, however, the Puerto Rico Sugar Corporation is not a
9 Title III debtor. It is, instead, a former government entity
10 which has subsequently been dissolved and is no longer in
11 existence. Neither the claim nor the response provide a basis
12 for asserting a claim against the debtor in respect of
13 liabilities purportedly owed by former government entities
14 such as the Sugar Corporation, and for those reasons we'd
15 request the Court sustain the objection and disallow the
16 claim, notwithstanding the response.

17 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford. I have some
18 questions for you. First, I would just like to confirm the
19 number of the claim to which the objection is directed. Is it
20 173753?

21 MS. STAFFORD: It is, Your Honor. Apologies if I
22 misspoke earlier.

23 THE COURT: I may just not have heard one of the
24 digits, but I wanted to confirm that.

25 Second, was the Sugar Corporation an entity that had

1 a separate legal identity from that of the Commonwealth and
2 the other Title III debtors?

3 MS. STAFFORD: My understanding is that it was a part
4 of the Puerto Rico Land Authority, which did have a separate,
5 independent legal personality.

6 THE COURT: So based on the debtors' research, is it
7 your representation that you have found no indication that the
8 Commonwealth or any of the other Title III debtors was
9 directly responsible for the liabilities of the Sugar
10 Corporation to its employees?

11 MS. STAFFORD: That's correct, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
14 is sustained as to Claim No. 173753 filed by Myriam S. Gandia,
15 and that claim is disallowed in its entirety, because it
16 asserts claims against an entity that is not a Title III
17 debtor and the claimant has provided no basis for a
18 determination of liability of a Title III debtor for the
19 subject of that claim. Claim 173753 is disallowed.

20 Now the next Agenda item is the 377th Omnibus
21 Objection, the response of Edwin Ortiz-Vazquez.

22 Ms. Stafford.

23 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

24 The 377th Omnibus Objection, which was filed at ECF
25 no. 17911, seeks to disallow proofs of claim that assert

1 multi-plaintiff litigations. However, the claimants
2 associated with the claims to be disallowed are not identified
3 in master proofs of claim filed on behalf of all plaintiffs in
4 those litigations by the attorneys representing all plaintiffs
5 in those litigations. The debtors, therefore, are not liable
6 to these claimants for the liabilities associated with the
7 litigations, because, according to the master proofs of claim
8 that have been filed, they are not plaintiffs in those
9 litigations.

10 The response filed was submitted by Edwin
11 Ortiz-Vazquez. It was mailed directly to the debtors, and
12 filed on the docket at ECF no. 20005-1 -- I apologize. There
13 are two responses filed at 20005-1, and three with certified
14 translations at 20005-2 and 4. These responses address Proof
15 of Claim No. 1 -- 47589.

16 That proof of claim purports to assert liabilities
17 associated with a litigation captioned *Alfredo Maldonado-Colon*
18 *v. Puerto Rico Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*,
19 with case no. KAC1996-1381. The attorney representing all
20 plaintiffs in this litigation submitted a master proof of
21 claim on behalf of all plaintiffs, and Mr. Ortiz-Vazquez is
22 not identified as one of the plaintiffs in that litigation.
23 Further, even if he were a plaintiff in the *Maldonado-Colon*
24 litigation, his claim would be preserved by the master proof
25 of claim filed on behalf of all plaintiffs in the litigation.

1 And for those reasons, we'd request the Court grant the
2 objection -- or sustain the objection and disallow the claim,
3 notwithstanding the responses.

4 THE COURT: To the extent he turns out to have been a
5 plaintiff in that litigation and covered by the master proof
6 of claim, this would not disallow any entitlement derived from
7 that master proof of claim; is that correct?

8 MS. STAFFORD: That is correct, Your Honor. He would
9 retain the right to -- or he would retain whatever interest he
10 might have pursuant to the master proof of claim to the extent
11 he is a part of that litigation.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 My ruling is as follows: The 377th Omnibus Objection
14 is sustained as to claim no. 47589 of Edwin Ortiz-Vazquez, and
15 that claim is disallowed in its entirety. Mr. Ortiz-Vazquez
16 has not demonstrated that he was a plaintiff in the litigation
17 that he cites, or otherwise demonstrated any basis for
18 concluding that he is the beneficiary of any judgment rendered
19 in that litigation. However, to the extent that he is covered
20 under a master proof of claim filed by counsel for plaintiffs
21 in that litigation, his claim is -- derived from the master
22 proof of claim, is not disallowed.

23 The next Agenda item -- I'm sorry. Ms. Stafford, did
24 you wish to say something?

25 MS. STAFFORD: No. Apologies.

1 THE COURT: Thank you.

2 The next Agenda item is Agenda Item IV.10, which is
3 the response of Eliud Ayala-Cruz to the 380th Omnibus
4 Objection.

5 Ms. Stafford?

6 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 The 380th Omnibus Objection, which was filed at ECF
8 no. 17916, seeks to disallow in their entirety proofs of claim
9 that assert liabilities purportedly owed to public employees
10 by entities that are not Title III debtors. This response, as
11 Your Honor noted, was filed by Eliud Ayala-Cruz, and was
12 submitted directly to the debtors and filed on the docket at
13 ECF no. 20006-1, with a certified translation available at
14 20006-2. And it addresses Proof of Claim No. 172052.

15 The claim asserts liabilities associated with
16 Mr. Ayala-Cruz's employment with the Puerto Rico Sugar
17 Corporation, which, as noted in our reply, is not a Title III
18 debtor, and was a part of an entity that was separate and
19 independent from the Commonwealth. Further, that entity has
20 subsequently been dissolved, and is no longer in existence.

21 The response opposes the objection on the basis that
22 Mr. Ayala-Cruz asserts he did not work at the Land Authority
23 and was, instead, in the agriculture columns. The objection
24 does not seek to disallow the claims on the basis that
25 Ayala-Cruz worked solely for the Land Authority in general,

1 but, rather, that he worked for the Sugar Corporation, which
2 was a part of the Land Authority. Neither the claim nor the
3 response provide a basis for asserting a claim against the
4 debtor -- against any of the Title III debtors in respect of
5 liabilities purportedly owed by the Sugar Corporation, or, for
6 that matter, the Land Authority. Accordingly, we'd request
7 the Court sustain the objection and disallow the claim,
8 notwithstanding the response.

9 THE COURT: Based on our conversation earlier
10 regarding the Sugar Corporation and the Land Authority, is it
11 the debtors' representation that the Land Authority was also a
12 separate legal entity from the Commonwealth?

13 MS. STAFFORD: Correct, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Thank you.

15 My ruling is as follows: The 380th Omnibus Objection
16 is sustained as to Claim No. 172052 filed by Eliud Ayala-Cruz,
17 and that claim is disallowed in its entirety. The claim
18 arises from obligations allegedly incurred by the Sugar
19 Corporation, or the Land Authority, which are separate
20 entities from the Commonwealth. Therefore, Claim No. 172052
21 is disallowed.

22 We have been notified that two claimants have arrived
23 in the courtroom to speak, and so the next Agenda item that we
24 will address will be Agenda Item V.2, which is the response of
25 Geraldo Silva-Rivera to the 380th Omnibus Objection.

1 Mr. Silva Rivera, would you please come to the
2 podium?

3 THE COURT: I don't see -- oh, there. Now I see
4 someone coming to the podium.

5 Good morning, Mr. Silva-Rivera.

6 MR. SILVA-RIVERA: Good morning.

7 THE COURT: Would you please state your full name?

8 MR. SILVA-RIVERA: Geraldo Silva-Rivera.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 I will first ask the lawyer for the Oversight Board
11 to explain the objection to your claim, and then I will ask
12 you to respond to that objection. You will hear a beep if
13 someone talks for more than three minutes -- I'm sorry.
14 You'll hear a beep when someone has three minutes remaining in
15 their time to speak, and then two beeps when their time to
16 speak is finished; but I will be sensitive and generous with
17 the time.

18 So, first, we will begin with Ms. Stafford.

19 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

20 The 380th Omnibus Objection, which was filed at ECF
21 no. 17916, seeks to disallow in their -- seeks to disallow
22 proofs of claim that assert liabilities purportedly owed to
23 public employees by entities that are not Title III debtors.
24 The response scheduled for hearing this morning was filed by
25 Geraldo Silva-Rivera with respect to Proof of Claim No.

1 172107, and it's available on the docket at ECF no. 20006-9,
2 with a certified translation available at 20006-10.

3 The claim asserts liabilities associated with
4 allegedly accrued but unpaid wages and salary adjustments owed
5 to Mr. Silva-Rivera as a result of his employment with the
6 Sugar Corporation. As set forth in the reply, however, the
7 Sugar Corporation is not a Title III debtor. Instead, it is a
8 former government entity, which has subsequently been
9 dissolved, and is no longer in existence. Further, it
10 was a -- when it was in existence, it was a separate,
11 independent entity from the Commonwealth.

12 The response consists of several pages from the
13 objection on which Mr. Silva-Rivera has added his signature,
14 and it does not otherwise dispute the arguments set forth in
15 the objection. Accordingly, since neither the claim nor the
16 response provides a basis for asserting a claim against the
17 debtor in respect of liabilities purportedly owed by former
18 government entities that were separate and independent from
19 the Commonwealth, we would respectfully request the Court
20 sustain the objection and disallow the claim.

21 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

22 Mr. Silva-Rivera, would you like to respond?

23 MR. SILVA-RIVERA: Well, according to some of the
24 documents that we have received, we are supposed to have a
25 right to claim.

1 THE COURT: There is a right to claim, sir, for
2 amounts that are owed by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
3 itself, or by the other debtor entities that are in the Title
4 III proceedings. The position of the Oversight Board here is
5 that the compensation that you are seeking to recover was
6 never owed by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico itself, but was
7 instead owed by the Sugar Corporation, which was separate from
8 the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. So the papers gave you an
9 opportunity to assert a claim that would be a debt of the
10 Commonwealth or another debtor, but their position is that the
11 claim that you have submitted is not for an amount owed by the
12 Commonwealth or another debtor, but, instead, is a claim
13 against the Sugar Corporation, which no longer exists.

14 You may go on.

15 MR. SILVA-RIVERA: Well, according to the documents
16 that I had received, I didn't know that one thing was mixed
17 with the other, but if that is the case, we can't do anything
18 about it.

19 THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

20 Ms. Stafford, any further remarks?

21 MS. STAFFORD: Nothing further, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Thank you.

23 I will now make my ruling. The 380th Omnibus
24 Objection is sustained as to Claim No. 172107 filed by Geraldo
25 Silva-Rivera. That claim is disallowed in its entirety,

1 because it arises from debts that were allegedly incurred by
2 the Sugar Corporation, which was a separate entity from the
3 Commonwealth. Claim No. 172107 is, therefore, disallowed.

4 Thank you for coming to court today,
5 Mr. Silva-Rivera. The hearing on your claim is concluded now.

6 MR. SILVA-RIVERA: Okay.

7 THE COURT: The next item that we will address is
8 Agenda Number V.13, which is the response of Luciano
9 Silva-Rivera to the 381st Omnibus Objection. So would Luciano
10 Silva-Rivera please come to the podium?

11 Good morning, Mr. Silva-Rivera. Would you please
12 state your full name?

13 MR. SILVA-RIVERA: Luciano Silva-Rivera.

14 THE COURT: Thank you.

15 I will first ask the attorney for the Oversight Board
16 to explain the objection to your claim.

17 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

18 This objection is the 381st Omnibus Objection, and it
19 was filed at ECF no. 17917. It seeks to disallow in their
20 entirety proofs of claim asserting liabilities purportedly
21 owed to public employees by entities that are not Title III
22 debtors.

23 The response scheduled for hearing this morning was
24 filed by Luciano Silva-Rivera with respect to Proof of Claim
25 No. 173011, and it was filed on the docket or is available on

1 the docket at ECF no. 20007-1, with a translation available at
2 20007-2. The claim asserts liabilities associated with
3 allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to Mr. Silva-Rivera as
4 a result of his employment with the Sugar Corporation. As set
5 forth in the reply, however, the Sugar Corporation is not a
6 Title III debtor. Instead, it was a separate and independent
7 entity from the Commonwealth, which has subsequently been
8 dissolved, and is no longer in existence.

9 The response does not address the debtors' contention
10 that it is not liable for liabilities purportedly owed by
11 former government entities separate from the Commonwealth,
12 such as the Sugar Corporation. Rather, it contains a copy of
13 several pages from the objection with Mr. Silva-Rivera's
14 signature appearing on certain of those pages. Because
15 neither the claim nor the response provides a valid legal
16 basis for asserting a claim against the debtor in respect of
17 liabilities purportedly owed by independent government
18 entities that have since been dissolved, the debtors would
19 request the Court sustain the objection and disallow the
20 claim, notwithstanding the response.

21 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

22 Mr. Silva-Rivera, would you like to speak in
23 response?

24 MR. SILVA-RIVERA: No. Really, there is nothing else
25 to say, other than, you know, we worked hard, and we woke up

1 | early at 4:00 AM in the morning to come here, because we
2 | believed that something could be done, that you would do
3 | something to help us. But if nothing could be done, and if it
4 | goes against your laws, there's nothing to be said other than
5 | good morning, thanks for nothing, and good-bye.

6 | THE COURT: I thank you for coming to court,
7 | Mr. Silva-Rivera. This proceeding is only for amounts that
8 | are owed by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico itself or the
9 | other debtors, and so, unfortunately, since the Sugar
10 | Corporation was a separate entity, I cannot allow your claim
11 | to go further in this proceeding.

12 | Ms. Stafford, did you wish to say anything further?

13 | MS. STAFFORD: Nothing further, Your Honor.

14 | THE COURT: My ruling is that the 381st Omnibus
15 | Objection is sustained as to Claim No. 173011 filed by Luciano
16 | Silva-Rivera, and that claim is disallowed in its entirety.
17 | The claim arises from debts allegedly incurred by the Sugar
18 | Corporation, which was a separate entity from the
19 | Commonwealth. Therefore, Claim 173011 is disallowed.

20 | Thank you, Mr. Silva-Rivera. This concludes the
21 | hearing on your claim, and I am sorry that I was not further
22 | able to address your claim.

23 | MR. SILVA-RIVERA: Thanks to everybody. God bless
24 | you, and good-bye.

25 | THE COURT: We will now return to the Agenda in

1 section IV. The next Agenda item is Number IV.11, which is
2 the response of Jorge A. Colon-Florez to the 380th Omnibus
3 Objection.

4 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 This objection was filed at ECF no. 17916, and it
6 also seeks to disallow proofs of claim asserting liabilities
7 purportedly owed to public employees by entities that are not
8 Title III debtors. And I just wanted to note for the record
9 as well that Mr. Jorge Colon-Florez's name is reflected on the
10 Claims Register as Mr. Jorge Felez, so I think that's the name
11 that appears in our reply. On further review of his response
12 and proof of claim, I suspect that was just a transcription
13 error and it is the same individual.

14 THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying that.

15 MS. STAFFORD: Of course, Your Honor.

16 The response was submitted directly to the debtors,
17 and filed on the docket at ECF no. 20006-5, with a certified
18 translation available at 20006-6, and it addresses Proof of
19 Claim No. 168285. The claim and response each assert
20 liabilities associated with Mr. Colon-Florez's employment with
21 the Puerto Rico Sugar Corporation.

22 The response does not address the debtors' contention
23 regarding the fact that the Puerto Rico Sugar Corporation is
24 not a part of the Commonwealth and has subsequently been
25 dissolved. Instead, it consists of a completed information

1 form asserting that Mr. Colon-Florez was employed by the Sugar
2 Corporation between 1979 and 2000, and that he is owed salary
3 increases and increased pension contributions. Neither the --
4 because neither the claim nor the response provide a basis for
5 asserting a claim against the debtor in respect of liabilities
6 purportedly owed by independent government entities that have
7 since been dissolved, the debtors would respectfully request
8 the Court sustain the objection and disallow the claim.

9 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

10 My ruling as to the response of Mr. Jorge
11 Colon-Florez is as follows: The 380th Omnibus Objection is
12 sustained as to Claim No. 168285 filed by Jorge Colon-Florez,
13 or Jorge Colon-Felez, and that claim is disallowed in its
14 entirety. The claim arises from obligations allegedly
15 incurred by the Sugar Corporation, which was a separate entity
16 from the Commonwealth. Claim No. 168285 is, therefore,
17 disallowed in its entirety.

18 The next Agenda item is Number IV.12, the 380th
19 Omnibus Objection, and the response to that objection of Julio
20 M. Lopez-Alvarez.

21 Ms. Stafford.

22 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 Mr. Lopez-Alvarez's response was submitted directly
24 to the debtors, and filed on the docket at 20006-7, with a
25 certified translation available at 20006-8. It addresses

1 Proof of Claim No. 171765. That claim asserts liabilities
2 associated with allegedly accrued but unpaid wages purportedly
3 owed by the Sugar Corporation, which, as discussed, is a
4 separate government entity that has subsequently been
5 dissolved, and is no longer in existence.

6 The response opposes the objection, because at the
7 time that Mr. Lopez-Alvarez worked for the Sugar Corporation,
8 he contends it was a part of the Commonwealth. However,
9 neither the claim nor the response provide a basis for
10 asserting a claim against the debtor in respect of liabilities
11 purportedly owed by independent entities that have since been
12 dissolved, and for that reason, we'd request the Court sustain
13 the objection and disallow the claim.

14 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

15 My ruling is as follows: The 380th Omnibus Objection
16 is sustained as to Claim No. 171765 filed by Julio M.
17 Lopez-Alvarez. That claim is disallowed in its entirety. The
18 claim arises from obligations allegedly incurred by the Sugar
19 Corporation, which was a separate entity from the
20 Commonwealth. Accordingly, Claim No. 171765 is disallowed in
21 its entirety.

22 The next Agenda item is the 380th Omnibus Objection,
23 and the response to that objection of Julio Cesar
24 Luna-Santiago.

25 Ms. Stafford?

1 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 Mr. Luna-Santiago filed two responses, which are
3 available on the docket at ECF nos. 18098 and 19177. Those
4 responses address Proof of Claim No. 169013. That claim
5 asserts liabilities associated with Mr. Luna-Santiago's
6 employment with the Sugar Corporation, which, as discussed, is
7 a separate entity which has subsequently been dissolved and is
8 no longer in existence.

9 The responses do not address the debtors' contention
10 that they are not liable for liabilities purportedly owed by
11 former government entities that were separate from the
12 Commonwealth. Rather, they provide additional information
13 regarding Mr. Luna-Santiago's employment with the Sugar
14 Corporation. Because neither the claim nor the responses
15 provide a basis for asserting a claim against the debtor in
16 respect of the Sugar Corporation, the debtors would
17 respectfully request the Court sustain the objection and
18 disallow the claim, notwithstanding the responses.

19 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

20 My ruling is that the 380th Omnibus Objection is
21 sustained as to claim no. 169013 filed by Julio Cesar
22 Luna-Santiago, and that claim is disallowed in its entirety.
23 The claim arises from obligations allegedly incurred by the
24 Sugar Corporation, which was a separate entity from the
25 Commonwealth. Claim 169013 is, therefore, disallowed.

1 The next Agenda item is Number IV.14, which has to do
2 with the 383rd Omnibus Objection, and the response to that
3 objection of Carmen R. Lopez-Camacho.

4 Ms. Stafford?

5 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 The 383rd Objection was filed at ECF no. 17922, and
7 it seeks to disallow proofs of claim asserting liabilities
8 purportedly owed to public employees by entities that are not
9 Title III debtors. This response was, as the Court noted,
10 filed by Carmen Lopez-Camacho with respect to Proof of Claim
11 No. 179349, and the response is available on the docket at ECF
12 no. 1842 -- I'm sorry, 19429.

13 The claim asserts liabilities associated with
14 Ms. Lopez-Camacho's employment with the Puerto Rico Telephone
15 Company. As set forth in the reply, however, the Telephone
16 Company is not a Title III debtor, but is a former government
17 entity that has subsequently been privatized, and is no longer
18 in existence.

19 The response opposes the objection, because,
20 according to Ms. Lopez-Camacho, she is seeking money she
21 believes she's owed pursuant to laws passed while the
22 Telephone Company was still a public entity. However, neither
23 the claim nor the response provides a basis for asserting a
24 claim against the debtor in respect of liabilities owed by the
25 Telephone Company, which has subsequently been privatized and

1 no longer exists. Accordingly, we would request the Court
2 sustain the objection and disallow the claim, notwithstanding
3 the response.

4 THE COURT: Ms. Stafford, is it the debtors' position
5 that the Telephone Company was a separate entity from the
6 Commonwealth, both while it was a government entity and after
7 it was privatized?

8 MS. STAFFORD: Correct, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 My ruling is as follows: The 383rd Omnibus Objection
11 is sustained as to Claim No. 179349 filed by Carmen R.
12 Lopez-Camacho, and that claim is disallowed in its entirety.
13 Ms. Lopez-Camacho's claim arises from debts allegedly incurred
14 by the Puerto Rico Telephone Company, which was a separate
15 entity from the Commonwealth, and has been privatized.
16 Accordingly, Claim No. 179349 is disallowed.

17 We will now turn to Agenda Item V, and the first
18 Agenda item in V is Number V.1, which is the response of
19 Natanael Ayala-Cruz to the 380th Omnibus Objection.

20 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 The response filed by Mr. Ayala-Cruz was submitted
22 directly to the debtors, and filed on the docket by the
23 debtors at ECF no. 20006-3, with a certified translation
24 available at ECF no. 20006-4, and it addresses Proof of Claim
25 No. 172114. The claim asserts liabilities associated with

1 allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to Mr. Ayala-Cruz as a
2 result of his employment with the Sugar Corporation. As
3 discussed, however, the Sugar Corporation is not a Title III
4 debtor, but, rather, it was a separate governmental entity
5 which has subsequently been dissolved and no longer exists.

6 The response consists of several pages from the
7 objection on which Mr. Ayala-Cruz has added his signature. It
8 does not otherwise dispute or address the arguments set forth
9 in the objection. Because neither the claim nor the response
10 provides a basis for asserting a claim against the debtor in
11 respect of liabilities purportedly owed by separate government
12 entities that no longer exist, the debtors respectfully
13 request the Court sustain the objection and disallow the
14 claim, notwithstanding the response.

15 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

16 My ruling is as follows: The 380th Omnibus Objection
17 is sustained as to Claim No. 172114 filed by Natanael
18 Ayala-Cruz, and that claim is disallowed in its entirety.
19 Claim No. 172114 arises from debts allegedly incurred by the
20 Sugar Corporation, which is a separate entity from the
21 Commonwealth. Claim 172114 is, therefore, disallowed.

22 The next Agenda item is Number V.3, which is the
23 380th Omnibus Objection, and the response to that objection of
24 Wilfredo Silva-Rivera.

25 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 This response was submitted directly to the debtors
2 and filed on the docket at ECF no. 20006-11, with a certified
3 translation available at ECF no. 20006-12, and it addresses
4 Proof of Claim No. 172169. The claim asserts liabilities
5 associated with allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to
6 Mr. Silva-Rivera as a result of his employment with the Sugar
7 Corporation, which, as discussed, is not a Title III debtor,
8 but, rather, a separate governmental entity which has
9 subsequently been dissolved and no longer exists.

10 The response consists of several pages from the
11 objection on which Mr. Silva-Rivera has added his signature,
12 and it does not otherwise address the arguments set forth in
13 the objection. Because neither the claim nor the response
14 provides a basis for asserting a claim against the debtor in
15 respect of liabilities owed by former government entities that
16 were separate from the Commonwealth, the debtors request the
17 Court sustain the objection and disallow the claim,
18 notwithstanding the response.

19 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

20 My ruling is as follows: The 374th Omnibus Objection
21 is sustained as to Claim No. 172169, and that claim is
22 disallowed in its entirety. Claim No. 172169 arises from
23 debts allegedly incurred by the Sugar Corporation, which is a
24 separate entity from the Commonwealth. I believe I misspoke
25 as to the relevant Omnibus Objection. It is the 380th Omnibus

1 Objection that is sustained as to Claim No. 172169.

2 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: The next Agenda item is Number IV.4,
4 which is the 381st Omnibus Objection, and the response to that
5 objection of Brenda T. Asencio-Bernardini.

6 Ms. Stafford.

7 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 This 381st Objection filed at ECF no. 17917 seeks to
9 disallow proofs of claim that assert liabilities owed --
10 purportedly owed to public employees by entities that are not
11 Title III debtors. The response filed by
12 Ms. Asencio-Bernardini was submitted on the docket at ECF no.
13 18216, and it addresses Proof of Claim No. 174322.

14 The claim asserts liabilities associated with
15 allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to
16 Ms. Asencio-Bernardini as a result of her employment with the
17 Puerto Rico Telephone Company, which, as set forth in the
18 reply, is not a Title III debtor. Rather, it is a former
19 government entity that was not a part of the Commonwealth, and
20 which has subsequently been dissolved and is no longer in
21 existence.

22 The response contends that the Court should not grant
23 the objection, because the claim asserts liabilities
24 associated with salary increases granted while the Telephone
25 Company was a part of the Government of Puerto Rico. However,

1 | neither the claim nor the response provides a basis for
2 | asserting a claim against the debtors in respect of
3 | liabilities purportedly owed by separate government entities
4 | that have subsequently been privatized and no longer exist.
5 | Accordingly, the debtors would request the Court sustain the
6 | objection and disallow the claim, notwithstanding the
7 | response.

8 | THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

9 | My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
10 | is sustained as to Claim No. 174322 filed by Brenda T.
11 | Asencio-Bernardini, and that claim is disallowed in its
12 | entirety. Claim No. 174322 arises from debts allegedly
13 | incurred by the Puerto Rico Telephone Company, which was a
14 | separate entity from the Commonwealth and has since been
15 | privatized. Claim No. 174322 is, therefore, disallowed.

16 | The next Agenda item is Number V.5, which is the
17 | 381st Omnibus Objection, and the response of Elia E. Castro to
18 | that objection.

19 | Ms. Stafford?

20 | MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 | Ms. Castro submitted a response at ECF no. 18417,
22 | which addresses Proof of Claim No. 174452, and I wanted to
23 | note for the record that a portion of this claim was
24 | transferred into ACR for resolution using this process -- that
25 | process. The claim asserts liabilities associated with

1 allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to Ms. Castro as a
2 result of her employment with the Puerto Rico Telephone
3 Company, which, as discussed, is not a Title III debtor, but,
4 rather, a separate entity of the Commonwealth that
5 subsequently was dissolved and privatized and no longer
6 exists.

7 The response contends that the Court should not grant
8 the objection, because the claim asserts liabilities
9 associated with salary increases granted while the Telephone
10 Company was a part of the Government of Puerto Rico. However,
11 neither the claim nor the response provides a basis for
12 asserting a claim against the debtors in respect of
13 liabilities purportedly owed by separate government entities
14 that have subsequently been privatized. Accordingly, we would
15 request the Court sustain the objection and disallow the
16 claim, notwithstanding the response.

17 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

18 My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
19 is sustained as to Claim No. 174452 filed by Elia E. Castro,
20 and that claim is disallowed in its entirety. Claim No.
21 174452 arises from debts allegedly incurred by the Puerto Rico
22 Telephone Company, which was a separate entity from the
23 Commonwealth and has since been privatized. Claim No. 174452
24 is, therefore, disallowed.

25 Another speaker has arrived in the courtroom, and so

1 we will now skip to Agenda Item Number VI.15, which is the
2 393rd Omnibus Objection, and the response of William
3 Maldonado-Morales to that objection.

4 Mr. Maldonado-Morales, would you please come to the
5 podium?

6 Good morning, Mr. Maldonado-Morales. Would you
7 please state your full name for the record?

8 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: Mr. William
9 Maldonado-Morales.

10 THE COURT: Thank you. I am first going to ask the
11 attorney for the Oversight Board to explain the objection to
12 your claim, and then I will invite you to respond.

13 Ms. Stafford, for the Oversight Board, would you
14 please speak?

15 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 The objection scheduled for hearing this morning is a
17 393rd Omnibus Objection, which was filed at ECF no. 17975.
18 This objection seeks to disallow proofs of claim filed after
19 the bar dates --

20 (Noise from microphone.)

21 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Counsel. If you could
22 repeat the last sentence? This is the court reporter.

23 MS. STAFFORD: Sure. Of course.

24 This objection seeks to disallow proofs of claim
25 which were filed after the bar dates established by this

1 Court's bar date orders. For the Commonwealth, COFINA, HTA,
2 ERS, and PREPA, that bar date is June 29th, 2018; and for PBA,
3 that bar date is July 29th, 2020.

4 Pursuant to the terms of the Bar Date Order, if a
5 claimant failed to file a proof of claim on or before the bar
6 date, that claimant would be forever barred, estopped, and
7 enjoined from asserting such claim against the debtors, and
8 the debtors would be discharged from indebtedness and
9 liability with respect to such claim.

10 The response to be addressed this morning was filed
11 at ECF no. 18553 with respect to Proof of Claim No. 179488.
12 That proof of claim was filed on August 10th, 2021, over three
13 years after the Commonwealth bar date. The response did not
14 dispute that the claim was not timely filed, rather, it
15 provides the following reasons for the failure to timely file
16 the proof of claim. First, that Mr. Maldonado-Morales
17 temporarily relocated to Texas following Hurricane Maria in
18 September 2017, and when Mr. Maldonado-Morales returned to
19 Puerto Rico in May of 2018, he had many letters to address and
20 other priorities at that time. Second, Mr. Maldonado-Morales
21 notes that, after the December 2019 earthquake, he had to
22 temporarily relocate within Puerto Rico. And, third,
23 Mr. Maldonado-Morales references the disruptions of the
24 COVID-19 pandemic.

25 While the debtors are deeply mindful of these

1 numerous disasters that have been suffered by the people of
2 Puerto Rico, none of these reasons are sufficient to establish
3 excusable neglect that would justify Mr. Maldonado-Morales'
4 failure to timely file a proof of claim. As an initial
5 matter, the delay in question here is over three years, which
6 is very substantial. Further, although Mr. Maldonado-Morales
7 was unfortunately forced to depart the island in September of
8 2017, he acknowledges that he had returned to the island and
9 had access to his mail in May of 2018, which was early --
10 prior to the bar date in June 2018. He also would have been
11 on the island in June 2018 when radio and newspaper
12 advertisements were run notifying individuals of the --

13 (Sound played.)

14 MS. STAFFORD: -- opportunity to file a claim.

15 THE COURT: You may continue your statement to the
16 conclusion.

17 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

18 Further, the December 2019 earthquakes and the
19 pandemic each occurred substantially after the June 2018 bar
20 date, and, therefore, they do not justify
21 Mr. Maldonado-Morales's failure to file a claim. Accordingly,
22 because Mr. Maldonado-Morales does not dispute that the claim
23 was not timely filed, and does not provide an explanation
24 sufficient to justify the untimely filing of the claim, we
25 would request the Court sustain the objection and disallow the

1 claim.

2 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

3 Mr. Maldonado-Morales, would you like to speak now?

4 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: Yes. I will explain the
5 reason why I was unable to answer many of these letters.

6 During Hurricane Maria, we were living in the countryside. I
7 live in the countryside. And after the hurricane, I had to
8 move downtown to my sister's house. She has a cement house.

9 Of all of the letters that I received, many of them I
10 couldn't understand, because I do not speak English. And with
11 everything related to the hurricane, and the rains and
12 everything, my priority was the life of my child. I have a
13 son who has Down Syndrome, and two heart surgeries, and that
14 of my wife who also has a heart surgery. And with all of
15 that, my daughter, who is in Texas, sent for me. And with all
16 this, my priority is that of my child and my wife, both of
17 whom were sick.

18 And I received a booklet, but it didn't say that
19 there was any money for me. And it wasn't until my daughter
20 came recently -- she knows English, and she took the steps to
21 find out about it. And she filed the claim for me.

22 And after the hurricanes, came the earthquakes, and
23 with the earthquakes, my son was out of control. He was very
24 upset. And for that reason, my daughter sent for us again,
25 and we went there again. And for that reason, I had no other

1 attention but for the life of my son.

2 And today I brought with me my wife and my son. They
3 were not allowed to come in, but I brought them so that you
4 could see the situation that I have. To me, it's money that I
5 have, but my priority is my son, not the money.

6 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Maldonado-Morales.

7 Ms. Stafford, would you like to speak further? As I
8 understand it, Mr. Maldonado-Morales is saying that the health
9 and safety issues presented by his family members were ones
10 that he had to put above everything, and that he was unable to
11 understand the documentation.

12 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 We are deeply sympathetic to the issues that
14 Mr. Maldonado-Morales has raised, and the concerns that he has
15 addressed, particularly with regard to the numerous
16 disruptions that he and other Puerto Ricans have suffered.
17 However, the materials that were submitted and were provided
18 notifying individuals of their right to file a proof of claim
19 were done in both English and Spanish, and so should have
20 been, you know, provided in a language that
21 Mr. Maldonado-Morales could understand. And although I am
22 deeply sympathetic, again, to the concerns of his wife and
23 son's health, as I understood his statement, those concerns
24 were arising principally after -- in the immediate aftermath
25 of the hurricanes in September 2017, and in the aftermath of

1 the earthquakes in December of 2019. But during that time
2 period for which proofs of claim were eligible to be filed or
3 able to be filed, or in the time leading up to the bar date in
4 June of 2018 and May of 2018, I didn't hear a statement that
5 these concerns were arising at that time that would have
6 prevented him from filing a claim in a timely fashion. And
7 so, Your Honor, we would still request the Court sustain the
8 objection.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 Mr. Maldonado-Morales, was there anything in the
11 period in May 2018 and afterward, when you came back and you
12 had your mail, that prevented you from attending to the
13 opportunity to file a proof of claim?

14 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: Yes. During Hurricane Maria,
15 we were with no electricity or water for about nine months.
16 We had no communications. The Post Office was closed, and
17 part of my correspondence was lost. Some of it didn't arrived
18 on time. And on top of that, by the time -- when we left, a
19 lot of my correspondence went to the wrong postal boxes, and I
20 actually had many problems with people who were asking me "how
21 come your correspondence is coming to my place."

22 THE COURT: Mr. Maldonado-Morales, did you have the
23 correspondence from the Oversight Board in the mail that you
24 received when you came back to the island in May of 2018? Did
25 you receive it when you came back?

1 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: Some of them turned up, but
2 they turned up late, and that's when my daughter came. And
3 that's why she filed a claim to see if I had the opportunity.

4 THE COURT: When did the correspondence that
5 concerned filing a proof of claim arrive at your house or come
6 into your possession?

7 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: In the last few months, when
8 we filed a claim, the last few letters arrived, and I sent a
9 photo to my daughter. And she said, daddy, I'm going to file
10 a claim for your case.

11 THE COURT: When did these letters arrive? You said
12 the last few months. Can you be any more specific?

13 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: Well, I have here the date of
14 the presentation was 8-10-2021.

15 THE COURT: August of 2021?

16 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

17 THE COURT: Does that mean yes? I need an answer in
18 words, please.

19 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Did you receive anything else in your
21 mail before August of 2021 regarding the filing of claims in
22 this bankruptcy proceeding?

23 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: I received a booklet, which I
24 have here with me. My name was on it, but there wasn't
25 anything about any amount of money there.

1 THE COURT: When did you receive the booklet?

2 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: Right now I cannot recall the
3 date.

4 THE COURT: Ms. Stafford, do you have a colleague
5 who's in the courtroom today?

6 MS. STAFFORD: I believe my colleague, Mr. Miranda,
7 is in the courtroom as well, yes.

8 THE COURT: What I am going to do is ask that
9 Mr. Maldonado-Morales show the documentation that he has, what
10 he's referring to as a booklet, to your colleague so that we
11 can determine whether that is something that had to do with
12 the filing of proofs of claim. So we will take a pause in the
13 hearing of Mr. Maldonado-Morales's claim.

14 Actually, at this point, it is a good time to take a
15 ten-minute break anyway, so we will take a ten-minute break,
16 and Mr. Maldonado-Morales can show his documentation to your
17 colleague. Perhaps you and your colleague can communicate,
18 and then we will continue after that. Thank you.

19 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you.

20 THE COURT: We are adjourned for ten minutes.

21 (At 11:07 AM, recess taken.)

22 (At 11:18 AM, proceedings reconvened.)

23 THE COURT: Ms. Tacoronte, is everyone ready to
24 proceed in San Juan?

25 COURTROOM DEPUTY: I believe so, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Ms. Stafford, are you ready to proceed?

2 MS. STAFFORD: I am, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Where is Mr. Maldonado-Morales? Is he
4 still in the courtroom, Ms. Tacoronte? I can't see the image
5 of the podium very well. Is Mr. Maldonado-Morales at the
6 podium?

7 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: Yes, I'm here.

8 THE COURT: Thank you. I'm sorry. I just couldn't
9 see the image very well.

10 So, Ms. Stafford, would you share whatever you have
11 learned and your position in light of that?

12 MS. STAFFORD: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

13 Mr. Miranda spoke with Mr. Maldonado-Morales, and
14 reviewed the documents he brought to court today. And my
15 understanding from Mr. Miranda is that that packet contains a
16 copy of the Omnibus Objection itself, as well as some of the
17 notifications that went out surrounding the Disclosure
18 Statement Hearing over the summer.

19 And in light of all that, Your Honor, we would -- we
20 understand that Mr. Maldonado-Morales may not have received
21 the Bar Date Notice itself. We do understand, however, that
22 advertisements were still made via newspaper and radio ads
23 during the time when Mr. Maldonado-Morales was back on the
24 island. And while we remain very sympathetic to the situation
25 that Mr. Maldonado-Morales has described, we would maintain

1 that Mr. Maldonado-Morales, like many other Puerto Ricans, was
2 suffering from many of these same conditions, and many others
3 were able to still file a proof of claim. And so we would
4 still request the Court disallow the claim.

5 THE COURT: Mr. Maldonado-Morales, is there anything
6 further that you would like to say?

7 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: We have had many situations,
8 like the COVID, and many difficulties. We have a son who is
9 in jail and all of that. It has effected us to heart, very
10 greatly, and there are many other things and other situations
11 that sometimes make you not think properly. They take you out
12 of proper thinking. And because of those situations that
13 we've been through, my wife has also suffered a lot for many
14 things that we've been through, like the loss of
15 grandchildren, and all that has affected her, as well as me.

16 I am somebody who is incapacitated, and I receive
17 Social Security. That's everything that I receive, and that
18 is what I use to sustain ourselves.

19 THE COURT: What do you mean, sir, when you say you
20 are incapacitated?

21 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: I was declared disabled,
22 because I hurt my back. I had a fractured back in 1991. So I
23 received disability benefits from Social Security before, and
24 now I'm receiving it due to my -- receiving them due to my
25 age. That is the only sustenance that we have. And my wife

1 takes care of our child. Our child is a boy who cannot fend
2 for himself. And my wife cannot work, because she has to take
3 care of him. She cannot help me. So the only sustenance that
4 we have is my Social Security payments, and that also pays for
5 her and for my child.

6 THE COURT: Thank you for explaining that, sir. I am
7 now going to make my ruling.

8 My ruling is as follows: The 393rd Omnibus Objection
9 is sustained as to Claim No. 179488 filed by Mr. William
10 Maldonado-Morales. That claim is disallowed in its entirety
11 as late-filed, because it was filed more than three years
12 after the Commonwealth's bar date.

13 The Court sympathizes with the numerous adversities
14 and challenges that Mr. Maldonado-Morales and his family have
15 suffered and continue to suffer. However,
16 Mr. Maldonado-Morales indicates that he was making difficult
17 choices, but, nonetheless, choices with respect to the things
18 that he would attend to under these adverse circumstances.
19 And the earthquakes, and the results of the impact of the
20 hurricane, and COVID-19, are matters that affected many, many
21 people in Puerto Rico who, nonetheless, attended to these
22 important financial claim matters timely.

23 Mr. Maldonado-Morales did receive some mail, at least
24 some mail relating to this, and there were also advertisements
25 on the radio and through newspapers to make sure that the bar

1 date and its significance were publicized throughout Puerto
2 Rico. Under this combination of circumstances, despite the
3 very, very difficult circumstances that are faced by
4 Mr. Maldonado-Morales and his family, I find that he has not
5 established the necessary showing of excusable neglect to file
6 a timely claim; the claim not only is untimely, it is three
7 years untimely; and that there were factors that were within
8 his reasonable control to the extent he was making choices as
9 to what to attend to; and, therefore, the objection to the
10 claim is sustained. Claim No. 179488 is disallowed.

11 Mr. Maldonado-Morales, this is my ruling under the
12 law. My sympathies are with you and your family, and I wish
13 safety and strength for you and your family. Thank you for
14 coming to court today.

15 MR. MALDONADO-MORALES: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: The hearing on your claim is concluded,
17 Mr. Maldonado-Morales.

18 The next Agenda item is one for which we return to
19 section V of the Agenda, and it is Agenda Item Number V.6,
20 which is the response of Marlene Garcia-Miranda to the 381st
21 Omnibus Objection.

22 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 This response was submitted at ECF no. 18175, and it
24 addresses Proof of Claim No. 17422 -- 222. And just for
25 clarity of the record, this is, again, the 381st Omnibus

1 Objection, which seeks to disallow proofs of claim asserting
2 liabilities purportedly owed to public employees by entities
3 that are not Title III debtors. The claim asserts liabilities
4 associated with allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to
5 Ms. Garcia-Miranda as a result of her employment with the
6 Puerto Rico Telephone Company. However, as discussed, the
7 Puerto Rico Telephone Company is not a Title III debtor, but
8 is, rather, a former government entity that has subsequently
9 been privatized, and is no longer in existence, and, during
10 its existence, was a separate entity from the Commonwealth.

11 The response contends that the Court should not grant
12 the objection, because the claim asserts liabilities
13 associated with salary increases granted while the Puerto Rico
14 Telephone Company was a public corporation. However, neither
15 the claim nor the response provide a basis for asserting a
16 claim against the debtor in respect of liabilities purportedly
17 owed by separate government entities that have subsequently
18 been privatized. Accordingly, we would respectfully request
19 the Court sustain the objection and disallow the claim,
20 notwithstanding the response.

21 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

22 My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
23 is sustained as to Claim No. 174222 filed by Marlene
24 Garcia-Miranda. That claim is disallowed in its entirety.
25 Claim No. 174222 arises from debts allegedly incurred by the

1 Puerto Rico Telephone Company, which was a separate entity
2 from the Commonwealth, and has now been privatized. Claim No.
3 174222 is disallowed in its entirety.

4 The next Agenda item is Agenda Item Number V.7, which
5 is the 381st Omnibus Objection, and specifically the response
6 of Elena Laboy-Christian to that objection.

7 Ms. Stafford?

8 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

9 This response was filed on the docket at ECF no.
10 18473 with respect to Proof of Claim No. 174570. The claim
11 asserts liabilities associated with allegedly accrued but
12 unpaid wages owed to Ms. Laboy-Christian as a result of her
13 employment with the Puerto Rico Telephone Company. The Puerto
14 Rico Telephone Company, however, is not a Title III debtor,
15 but a separate entity that has subsequently been privatized
16 and no longer exists.

17 The response contends the Court should not grant the
18 objection, because the claim asserts liabilities associated
19 with salary increases granted while the Puerto Rico Telephone
20 Company was a public corporation, but neither the claim nor
21 the response provides a basis for asserting a claim against
22 the debtor in respect of liabilities purportedly owed by
23 separate government entities that have subsequently been
24 privatized. Accordingly, we'd respectfully request the Court
25 sustain the objection and disallow the claim, notwithstanding

1 the response.

2 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

3 My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
4 is sustained as to Claim No. 174570 filed by Elena
5 Laboy-Christian, and that claim is disallowed in its entirety.
6 Claim No. 174570 arises from debts allegedly incurred by the
7 Puerto Rico Telephone Company, which was a separate entity
8 from the Commonwealth and has now been privatized. Claim No.
9 174570 is disallowed.

10 The next Agenda item is also the 381st Omnibus
11 Objection. This item is the response of Gloria Maria
12 Lebron-Crespo to that objection.

13 Ms. Stafford?

14 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 This response was filed at ECF no. 19153, and it
16 addresses Proof of Claim No. 173516. The claim asserts
17 liabilities associated with allegedly accrued but unpaid wages
18 owed to Ms. Lebron-Crespo as a result of her husband's
19 employment with the Sugar Corporation, which, as discussed, is
20 a -- is not a Title III debtor, but rather was a separate
21 entity that has subsequently been dissolved and no longer
22 exists.

23 The response does not address the debtors' contention
24 that they are not liable for the liabilities asserted in the
25 Lebron-Crespo claim. Instead, it simply states that Ms.

1 | Lebron-Crespo is making a claim based on the PROMESA law for
2 | her husband, who worked for the Sugar Corporation. Because
3 | neither the claim nor the response provides a basis for
4 | asserting a claim against the debtor in respect of liabilities
5 | purportedly owed by the Sugar Corporation, we would
6 | respectfully request the Court sustain the objection and
7 | disallow the claim, notwithstanding the response.

8 | THE COURT: Thank you.

9 | My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
10 | is sustained as to Claim No. 173516 filed by Gloria Maria
11 | Lebron-Crespo, and that claim is disallowed in its entirety.
12 | Claim No. 173516 arises from debts allegedly incurred by the
13 | Sugar Corporation, which was a separate entity from the
14 | Commonwealth. Accordingly, Claim No. 173516 is disallowed in
15 | its entirety.

16 | The next Agenda item is also related to the 381st
17 | Omnibus Objection. It is the response of Lucinda
18 | Martinez-Quinones to that objection.

19 | Ms. Stafford?

20 | MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 | This response was filed on the docket at ECF no.
22 | 18213, and it addresses Proof of Claim No. 174460. The claim
23 | asserts liabilities associated with allegedly accrued but
24 | unpaid wages owed to Ms. Martinez-Quinones as a result of her
25 | employment with the Puerto Rico Telephone Company. The Puerto

1 Rico Telephone Company, however, is not a Title III debtor,
2 but, rather, a separate entity which has subsequently been
3 privatized and no longer exists.

4 The response contends that the Court should not grant
5 the objection because the claim asserts liabilities associated
6 with salary increases granted while the Telephone Company was
7 a public corporation. However, neither the claim nor the
8 response provide a basis for asserting a claim against the
9 debtor in respect of liabilities owed by former government
10 entities that were separate from the Commonwealth and have
11 subsequently been privatized. Accordingly, we would
12 respectfully request the Court sustain the objection and
13 disallow the claim, notwithstanding the response.

14 THE COURT: Thank you.

15 My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
16 is sustained as to Claim No. 174460 filed by Lucinda
17 Martinez-Quinones. That claim is disallowed in its entirety,
18 because it arises from debts allegedly incurred by the Puerto
19 Rico Telephone Company, which was a separate entity from the
20 Commonwealth and has now been privatized. Claim 174460 is
21 disallowed in its entirety.

22 The next Agenda item is Item V.10, which is the 381st
23 Omnibus Objection, and the response of Jose Orlando
24 Ortiz-Ortiz to that objection.

25 Ms. Stafford?

1 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 Mr. Ortiz-Ortiz submitted a response directly to the
3 debtors, which was filed on the docket at ECF no. 20007-3,
4 with a certified translation available at 20007-4. The claim
5 asserts liabilities associated with allegedly accrued but
6 unpaid wages owed to Mr. Ortiz-Ortiz as a result of his
7 employment with the Sugar Corporation. The Sugar Corporation,
8 however, is not a Title III debtor, but was formerly a
9 separate entity of the Commonwealth -- an entity separate from
10 the Commonwealth, and has subsequently been dissolved.

11 The response does not address the debtors' contention
12 that it is not liable for liabilities owed by the Sugar
13 Corporation. Instead, it contains a copy of certain pages
14 from the objection and certain identification documents
15 relating to Mr. Ortiz-Ortiz. Because neither the claim nor
16 the response provide a basis for asserting a claim against the
17 debtor in respect of liabilities owed by the Sugar
18 Corporation, we'd respectfully request the Court sustain the
19 objection and disallow the claim, notwithstanding the
20 response.

21 THE COURT: Thank you.

22 My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
23 is sustained as to Claim No. 174125 of Jose Orlando
24 Ortiz-Ortiz. That claim is disallowed in its entirety. Claim
25 No. 174125 arises from debts allegedly incurred by the Sugar

1 Corporation, which is a separate entity from the Commonwealth.
2 Claim 174125 is disallowed.

3 The next Agenda item is also related to the 381st
4 Omnibus Objection. It is the response of Wilfredo Pagan-Duran
5 to that objection.

6 Ms. Stafford?

7 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 Mr. Pagan-Duran filed an objection -- a response to
9 the objection on the docket at ECF no. 18212, and that
10 response addresses Proof of Claim No. 174470. This claim
11 asserts liabilities associated with allegedly accrued but
12 unpaid wages owed to Mr. Pagan-Duran as a result of his
13 employment with the Puerto Rico Telephone Company. The Puerto
14 Rico Telephone Company, however, is not a Title III debtor,
15 but was a separate entity from the Commonwealth that has
16 subsequently been privatized and no longer exists.

17 The response contends the Court should not grant the
18 objection, because the Pagan-Duran claim asserts liabilities
19 associated with salary increases granted while the Puerto Rico
20 Telephone Company was a public corporation, but neither the
21 claim nor the response provides a basis for asserting a claim
22 against the debtor in respect of liabilities purportedly owed
23 by separate government entities that have subsequently been
24 privatized. Accordingly, we'd request the Court sustain the
25 objection and disallow the claim, notwithstanding the

1 response.

2 THE COURT: Thank you.

3 My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
4 is sustained as to Claim No. 174470 filed by Wilfredo
5 Pagan-Duran, and that claim is disallowed in its entirety.
6 Claim No. 174470 arises from debts allegedly incurred by the
7 Puerto Rico Telephone Company, which is a separate entity from
8 the Commonwealth. Accordingly, Claim 174470 is disallowed.

9 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: The next Agenda item is Agenda Item V.12,
11 which also has to do with the 381st Omnibus Objection. It is
12 the response of Jose Rodriguez-Arroyo to that objection.

13 Ms. Stafford.

14 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 The response submitted by Mr. Rodriguez-Arroyo was
16 file on the docket at ECF no. 18217, and it addresses Proof of
17 Claim No. 174583. This claim asserts liabilities associated
18 with allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to
19 Mr. Rodriguez-Arroyo as a result of his employment with the
20 Telephone Company. As noted, however, the Telephone Company
21 is not a Title III debtor but a former government entity that
22 has subsequently been privatized and no longer exists.

23 The response contends that the Court should not grant
24 the objection, because the claim asserts liabilities
25 associated with salary increases granted while the Telephone

1 Company was a public corporation, but neither the claim nor
2 the response provide a basis for asserting a claim against the
3 debtor in respect of liabilities purportedly owed by the
4 Telephone Company. And for those reasons, we'd request the
5 Court sustain the objection and disallow the claim,
6 notwithstanding the response.

7 THE COURT: Thank you.

8 My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
9 is sustained as to Claim No. 174583 of Jose Rodriguez-Arroyo,
10 and that claim is disallowed in its entirety. Claim No.
11 174583 arises from debts allegedly incurred by the Puerto Rico
12 Telephone Company, which is a separate entity from the
13 Commonwealth. Claim 174583 is disallowed in its entirety.

14 We have already addressed the final Agenda item under
15 section V of the Agenda. That was no. 13. So now we will go
16 on to the remainder of the items in Agenda section VI, the
17 first of which is Agenda Item VI.1, also having to do with the
18 381st Omnibus Objection. It is the response of Brenda
19 Ortiz-Castellano to that objection.

20 Ms. Stafford?

21 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

22 The response filed by Ms. Ortiz-Castellano was
23 submitted onto the docket at ECF no. 18173, and it addresses
24 Proof of Claim No. 175075. The claim asserts liabilities
25 associated with allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to

1 Ms. Ortiz-Castellano as a result of her employment with the
2 Telephone Company. The Telephone Company, however, as noted,
3 is not a Title III debtor, but a separate entity that has
4 subsequently been privatized and no longer exists.

5 The response contends the Court should not grant the
6 objection, because the claim asserts liabilities associated
7 with salary increases granted while the Telephone Company was
8 a public corporation, but neither the claim nor the response
9 provide a basis for asserting a claim against the debtor in
10 respect of liabilities purportedly owed by the Telephone
11 Company. And for those reasons, we'd respectfully request the
12 Court sustain the objection and disallow the claim,
13 notwithstanding the response.

14 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

15 My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
16 is sustained as to Claim No. 175075 filed by Brenda
17 Ortiz-Castellano. That claim is disallowed in its entirety.
18 The claim arises from debts allegedly incurred by the Puerto
19 Rico Telephone Company, which was a separate entity from the
20 Commonwealth and has now been privatized. Accordingly, Claim
21 No. 175075 is disallowed in its entirety.

22 The next Agenda item is Number VI.2, also arising in
23 connection with the 381st Omnibus Objection. This is the
24 response of Angel Reyes-Miranda to that objection.

25 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 Mr. Reyes-Miranda filed a response on the docket at
2 ECF no. 18263, and it addresses Proof of Claim No. 174960.
3 The claim asserts liabilities associated with allegedly
4 accrued but unpaid wages owed to Mr. Reyes-Miranda as a result
5 of his employment with the Puerto Rico Telephone Company. The
6 Puerto Rico Telephone Company, however, is not a Title III
7 debtor but a former government entity -- a separate government
8 entity that has subsequently been privatized and no longer
9 exists.

10 The response contends the Court should not grant the
11 objection, because the claim asserts liabilities associated
12 with salary increases granted while the Telephone Company was
13 a public corporation, but neither the claim nor the response
14 provides a basis for asserting a claim against the debtor in
15 respect of liabilities owed by separate entities that no
16 longer -- that have been privatized. And for those reasons,
17 we'd request the Court sustain the objection and disallow the
18 claim.

19 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

20 My ruling is as follows: The 381st Omnibus Objection
21 is sustained as to Claim No. 174960 filed by Angel
22 Reyes-Miranda. That claim is disallowed in its entirety. The
23 claim arises from debts allegedly incurred by the Puerto Rico
24 Telephone Company, which was a separate entity from the
25 Commonwealth and has now been privatized. Claim No. 174960 is

1 disallowed in its entirety.

2 The next Agenda item is Number VI.3, which arises in
3 connection with the 382nd Omnibus Objection, and it is the
4 response of Hilda Cruz-Roman to that objection.

5 Ms. Stafford.

6 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 The 382nd Objection was filed at ECF no. 17920, and
8 it seeks to disallow proofs of claim asserting liabilities
9 purportedly owed to public employees by entities that are not
10 Title III debtors. Ms. Cruz-Roman filed a response on the
11 docket at ECF no. 19344, and it addresses Proof of Claim Nos.
12 176520 and 178145. The claims assert liabilities associated
13 with allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to Ms. Cruz-Roman
14 as a result of her employment with the Puerto Rico Telephone
15 Company, which, as discussed, was a separate entity that has
16 subsequently been privatized and no longer exists.

17 The response does not directly address the debtors'
18 contention that they are not liable for liabilities owed by
19 the Puerto Rico Telephone Company. Instead, it provides an
20 update regarding Cruz-Roman's mailing address, and notes that
21 it is seeking compensation for a period when the Puerto Rico
22 Telephone Company was a part of the government or was a public
23 corporation.

24 Neither the claim nor the response, however, provides
25 a basis for asserting a claim against the debtor in respect of

1 liabilities purportedly owed by the Puerto Rico Telephone
2 Company, and, for those reasons, we'd request the Court
3 sustain the objection and disallow the claims, notwithstanding
4 the response.

5 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

6 My ruling is as follows: The 382nd Omnibus Objection
7 is sustained as to Claim Nos. 176520 and 178145. Those claims
8 are disallowed in their entirety. They arise from debts
9 allegedly incurred by the Puerto Rico Telephone Company, which
10 was a separate entity from the Commonwealth and has now been
11 privatized. Claim Nos. 176520 and 178145 are disallowed.

12 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: The next Agenda item is Number VI.4,
14 which arises in connection with the 382nd Omnibus Objection.
15 It is the response of Damaris Martinez-Centeno to that
16 objection.

17 Ms. Stafford.

18 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 Ms. Martinez-Centeno's response was filed on the
20 docket at ECF no. 18055, and it addresses Proof of Claim No.
21 176315. That claim asserts liabilities associated with
22 allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to
23 Ms. Martinez-Centeno as a result of her employment with the
24 Telephone Company. The Telephone Company, however, is not a
25 Title III debtor, but, rather, is a former government entity

1 that was separate from the Commonwealth and has subsequently
2 been privatized.

3 The response contends the Court should not grant the
4 objection, because the claim asserts liabilities arising while
5 the Telephone Company was a public corporation. However,
6 neither the claim nor the response provides a basis for
7 asserting a claim against the debtor in respect of liabilities
8 purportedly owed by former government entities. The debtors,
9 therefore, respectfully request the Court sustain the
10 objection and disallow the claim, notwithstanding the
11 response.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 My ruling is as follows: The 382nd Omnibus Objection
14 is sustained as to Claim No. 176315 filed by Damaris
15 Martinez-Centeno. That claim is disallowed in its entirety,
16 because it arises from debts allegedly incurred by the Puerto
17 Rico Telephone Company, which was a separate entity from the
18 Commonwealth and has now been privatized. Claim 176315 is
19 disallowed in its entirety.

20 The next Agenda item also relates to the 382nd
21 Omnibus Objection. It is the response of Elizabeth
22 Martinez-Centeno to that objection.

23 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

24 Ms. Martinez-Centeno's response was filed on the
25 docket at ECF no. 18054, and it addresses Proof of Claim No.

1 176117. The claim asserts liabilities associated with
2 allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to
3 Ms. Martinez-Centeno as a result of her employment with the
4 Puerto Rico Telephone Company. The Puerto Rico Telephone
5 Company, however, is not a Title III debtor, but, rather, was
6 a separate government entity that has subsequently been
7 privatized and no longer exists.

8 The response contends the Court should not grant the
9 objection, because the claim asserts liabilities arising while
10 the Telephone Company was a public corporation. However,
11 neither the claim nor the response provides a basis for
12 asserting a claim against the debtor in respect of liabilities
13 purportedly owed by the Telephone Company, and, for those
14 reasons, we'd request the Court sustain the objection and
15 disallow the claim, notwithstanding the response.

16 THE COURT: Thank you.

17 My ruling is as follows: The 382nd Omnibus Objection
18 is sustained as to Claim No. 176117 filed by Elizabeth
19 Martinez-Centeno. That claim is disallowed in its entirety.
20 It arises from debts allegedly incurred by the Puerto Rico
21 Telephone Company, which was a separate entity from the
22 Commonwealth and has now been privatized. Claim 176117 is
23 disallowed in its entirety.

24 The next Agenda item is Agenda Item VI.6, which also
25 arises in connection with the 382nd Omnibus Objection. It is

1 the response of Millie Ramos-Perez to that objection.

2 Ms. Stafford.

3 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 This objection seeks to disallow in their entirety
5 proofs of claim purportedly -- asserting liabilities
6 purportedly owed to public employees by entities that are not
7 Title III debtors, and the response was filed at ECF no. 18309
8 with respect to Proof of Claim No. 176003. That claim asserts
9 liabilities associated with allegedly accrued but unpaid wages
10 owed to Ms. Ramos-Perez as a result of her employment with the
11 Telephone Company. The Telephone Company, however, is not a
12 Title III debtor, but, rather, a former government entity that
13 was separate from the Commonwealth and has subsequently been
14 privatized.

15 The response contends that the Court should not grant
16 the objection, because the claim asserts liabilities
17 associated with salary increases granted while the Telephone
18 Company was a public corporation, but neither the claim nor
19 the response provides a basis for asserting a claim against
20 the debtor in respect of liabilities purportedly owed by the
21 Telephone Company. Accordingly, we would respectfully request
22 the Court sustain the objection and disallow the claim,
23 notwithstanding the response.

24 THE COURT: Thank you.

25 My ruling is as follows: The 382nd Omnibus Objection

1 is sustained as to Claim No. 176003 filed by Millie
2 Ramos-Perez, and that claim is disallowed in its entirety.
3 The claim arises from debts allegedly incurred by the Puerto
4 Rico Telephone Company, which is a separate entity from the
5 Commonwealth that has since been privatized. Accordingly,
6 Claim 176003 is disallowed in its entirety.

7 The next Agenda item also arises in connection with
8 the 382nd Omnibus Objection. It is the response to that
9 objection of Maria Enid Roca-Troche.

10 Ms. Stafford.

11 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 Ms. Roca-Troche submitted a response directly to the
13 debtors, which was filed at ECF no. 20008-1, with a certified
14 translation available at 20008-2, and that response addresses
15 Proof of Claim No. 178337. And I'd just note for the record
16 that a portion of this claim has been transferred into ACR for
17 resolution using those processes.

18 The claim asserts -- or the portion of the claim
19 addressed today asserts liabilities associated with allegedly
20 accrued but unpaid wages owed to Ms. Roca-Troche as a result
21 of her employment with the Puerto Rico Telephone Company.
22 That Telephone Company, however, is not a Title III debtor,
23 but, rather, is a former government entity that was separate
24 from the Commonwealth and has subsequently been privatized.

25 The response consists of copies of letters sent to

1 Ms. Roca-Troche in connection with the resolution of her claim
2 in ACR, and it also contends that the Court should not grant
3 the objection, because the Roca-Troche claim asserts
4 liabilities associated with salary increases granted while the
5 Puerto Rico Telephone Company was a public corporation.

6 With respect to the portion of the claim asserting
7 salary increases, neither the claim nor the response provides
8 a basis for asserting a claim against the debtor in respect of
9 liabilities purportedly owed by former government entities,
10 and, accordingly, the debtors would respectfully request the
11 Court sustain the objection and disallow the portion of the
12 Roca-Troche claim concerning wage increases at the Puerto Rico
13 Telephone Company, notwithstanding the response.

14 THE COURT: The response material that was filed on
15 the docket at 20008-2 includes a response directed to Claim
16 174643, as well as a response directed to Claim 178337. Are
17 you seeking for me to take any action relating to Claim 174643
18 today?

19 MS. STAFFORD: Not at this time, no.

20 THE COURT: Thank you.

21 I will make my ruling now, which is as follows: The
22 382nd Omnibus Objection is sustained as to the portion of
23 Claim No. 178337 of Maria Enid Roca-Troche that has not been
24 transferred into the ACR process. This remaining portion of
25 the claim is disallowed in its entirety, because it arises

1 from debts allegedly owed by the Puerto Rico Telephone
2 Company, which was a separate entity from the Commonwealth and
3 has now been privatized.

4 The next Agenda item -- I'm sorry. Ms. Stafford, did
5 you wish to saying something?

6 MS. STAFFORD: No. No, Your Honor. Apologies.

7 THE COURT: Thank you.

8 The next Agenda item also arises in connection with
9 the 382nd Omnibus Objection. It is the response of Aixa Edmee
10 Rodriguez-Fernandez to that objection.

11 Ms. Stafford.

12 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 The response submitted by Aixa Edmee
14 Rodriguez-Fernandez was -- there were two responses filed on
15 the docket, one at ECF no. 18171 and one at 19823, with
16 respect to Proof of Claim No. 178223. The claim itself
17 asserts liabilities associated with allegedly accrued but
18 unpaid wages owed to Ms. Rodriguez-Fernandez as a result of
19 her employment with the Telephone Company. As set forth in
20 the reply, however, the Telephone Company is not a Title III
21 debtor, but, rather, is a former government entity that has
22 subsequently been dissolved -- been privatized and no longer
23 exists. And while it did exist, it was a separate entity from
24 the Commonwealth.

25 The response contends the Court should not grant the

1 objection, because the claim asserts liabilities associated
2 with salary increases granted while the Telephone Company was
3 a part of the -- was a public corporation, but neither the
4 claim nor the response provides a basis for asserting a claim
5 against the debtor in respect of the Telephone Company. And
6 for those reasons, we'd request the Court sustain the
7 objection and disallow the claim, notwithstanding the
8 response.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 My ruling is as follows: The 382nd Omnibus Objection
11 is sustained as to Claim No. 178223 filed by Aixa Edmee
12 Rodriguez-Fernandez. That claim is disallowed in its
13 entirety. The claim arises from debts allegedly incurred by
14 the Puerto Rico Telephone Company, which is a separate entity
15 from the Commonwealth. It was a separate entity from the
16 Commonwealth, and it has since been privatized. Claim 178223
17 is disallowed in its entirety.

18 The next Agenda item also arises from the 382nd
19 Omnibus Objection to claims. It is Agenda Item VI.9, and it
20 is the response of Jacqueline Rosado-Colon.

21 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

22 This response was submitted directly to the debtors
23 and filed on the docket at 20008-3, with a certified
24 translation available at 20008-4, and that response addresses
25 Proof of Claim No. 178406. The claim asserts liabilities

1 associated with allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to
2 Ms. Rosado-Colon as a result of her employment with the
3 Telephone Company. It also -- a portion of the claim also
4 asserted liabilities that have been transferred into ACR, and
5 that portion of the claim has been resolved in ACR. The
6 Telephone Company, however, is not a Title III debtor, but,
7 rather, is a separate government entity that has subsequently
8 been privatized and no longer exists.

9 The response contends that the Court should not grant
10 the objection with respect to the portion of the claim
11 asserting liabilities associated with salary increases granted
12 during the time the Puerto Rico Telephone Company was in
13 existence, because, during that time, the Puerto Rico
14 Telephone Company was a public corporation. However, neither
15 the claim nor the response provides a basis for asserting
16 liabilities against the debtors in respect of liabilities
17 purportedly owed by separate entities that have subsequently
18 been privatized. And, for those reasons, we'd request the
19 Court sustain the objection and disallow the claim,
20 notwithstanding the response.

21 THE COURT: Thank you.

22 My ruling is as follows: The 382nd Omnibus Objection
23 is sustained as to Claim No. 178406, specifically as to the
24 portion of the claim that was not transferred into ACR and
25 resolved there. That remaining portion of the claim is

1 disallowed in its entirety, because it arises from debts
2 allegedly incurred and owed by the Puerto Rico Telephone
3 Company, which was a separate entity from the Commonwealth and
4 has now been privatized. Claim 178406 is disallowed to the
5 extent that it has not been addressed in the ACR process.

6 The next Agenda item is Number VI.10, also arising in
7 connection with the 382nd Omnibus Objection, and this is the
8 response of Ann M. Ruiz to that objection.

9 Ms. Stafford.

10 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

11 Ms. Ruiz's response was filed on the docket at ECF
12 no. 18250, and it addresses Proof of Claim No. 176202. That
13 claim asserts liabilities associated with allegedly accrued
14 but unpaid wages owed to Ms. Ruiz as a result of her
15 employment with the Puerto Rico Telephone Company. The Puerto
16 Rico Telephone Company, however, was a separate government
17 entity, which has subsequently been privatized and no longer
18 exists.

19 The response contends that the Court should not grant
20 the objection, because the claim asserts liabilities
21 associated with salary increases granted while the Puerto Rico
22 Telephone Company was a public corporation, but neither the
23 claim nor the response provides a basis for asserting a claim
24 against the debtors in respect of liabilities purportedly owed
25 by the Telephone Company. And, for those reasons, we'd

1 respectfully request the Court sustain the objection and
2 disallow the claim, notwithstanding the response.

3 THE COURT: Thank you.

4 My ruling is as follows: The 382nd Omnibus Objection
5 is sustained as to Claim No. 176202 filed by Ann Ruiz. That
6 claim is disallowed in its entirety. The claim arises from
7 debts allegedly incurred by the Puerto Rico Telephone Company,
8 which was a separate entity from the Commonwealth, and has
9 since been privatized. Claim 176202 is disallowed in its
10 entirety.

11 The next Agenda item is Number VI.11, which is also
12 in connection with the 382nd Omnibus Objection. It is the
13 response of Amarilis Santana-Velazquez to that objection.

14 Ms. Stafford?

15 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 Ms. Santana-Velazquez's response was filed on the
17 docket at ECF no. 18265, and it addresses Proof of Claim No.
18 178024. That claim asserts liabilities associated with
19 allegedly accrued but unpaid wages owed to
20 Ms. Santana-Velazquez as a result of her employment with the
21 Telephone Company. It also asserts additional liabilities,
22 which have been transferred into ACR and resolved via those
23 processes. As set forth in the reply, however, the Telephone
24 Company is not a Title III debtor, but is, instead, a -- was a
25 separate public corporation, which has subsequently been

1 | privatized and no longer exists.

2 | The response contends that the Court should not grant
3 | the objection, because the claim asserts liabilities
4 | associated with salary increases granted while the telephone
5 | company was a public corporation. However, neither the claim
6 | nor the response provides a basis for asserting a claim
7 | against the debtor in respect of liabilities purportedly owed
8 | by the Puerto Rico Telephone Company, and, for those reasons,
9 | we'd respectfully request the Court sustain the objection and
10 | disallow the claim, notwithstanding the response.

11 | THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stafford.

12 | My ruling is as follows: The 382nd Omnibus Objection
13 | is sustained as to the portion of Claim No. 178024 filed by
14 | Amarilis Santana-Velazquez that has not been transferred into
15 | ACR and resolved in ACR. The remaining portion of Claim
16 | 178024 is disallowed in its entirety, because it arises from
17 | debts allegedly incurred by the Puerto Rico Telephone Company,
18 | which was a separate entity from the Commonwealth, and has now
19 | been privatized.

20 | The next Agenda item is Agenda Item VI.12, also in
21 | connection with the 382nd Omnibus Objection. It is the
22 | response of Wilson Velazquez-Pierantoni to that objection.

23 | Ms. Stafford?

24 | MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

25 | Mr. Velazquez-Pierantoni's response was filed on the

1 docket at ECF no. 18262, and it addresses Proof of Claim No.
2 178412. That claim asserts liabilities associated with
3 allegedly accrued but unpaid wages purportedly owed to
4 Mr. Velazquez-Pierantoni as a result of his employment with
5 the Telephone Company. The Puerto Rico Telephone Company,
6 however, is not a Title III debtor, and was, instead, a
7 separate public entity -- public corporation, which has
8 subsequently been privatized and no longer exists.

9 The response contends the Court should not grant the
10 objection, because the Velazquez-Pierantoni claim asserts
11 liabilities associated with salary increases granted while the
12 Puerto Rico Telephone Company was a public corporation, but
13 neither the claim nor the response provides a basis for
14 asserting a claim against the debtor in respect of liabilities
15 purportedly owed by the Puerto Rico Telephone Corporation --
16 Company, excuse me. And for those reasons, we would
17 respectfully request the Court sustain the objection and
18 disallow the claim, notwithstanding the response.

19 THE COURT: Thank you.

20 My ruling is as follows: The 382nd Omnibus Objection
21 is sustained as to Claim No. 178412 filed by Wilson
22 Velazquez-Pierantoni, and that claim is disallowed in its
23 entirety. The claim arises from debts allegedly incurred by
24 the Puerto Rico Telephone Company, which was a separate entity
25 from the Commonwealth and has now been privatized. Claim No.

1 178412 is disallowed in its entirety.

2 The next Agenda item is Agenda Item VI.13. It arises
3 in connection with the 393rd Omnibus Objection, and it is the
4 response of Janet Colon-Cosme to that objection.

5 Ms. Stafford.

6 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 The 393rd Omnibus Objection was filed at ECF no.
8 17975, and it seeks to disallow proofs of claim filed after
9 the bar dates established by this Court's bar date orders.
10 The response was filed at ECF no. 18170, and it addresses
11 Proof of Claim Nos. 179470, 179471, and 179472. Each of those
12 claims was filed on August 2nd, 2021, over three years after
13 the Commonwealth's bar date.

14 The response does not dispute that the claims were
15 not timely filed. Rather, it states that Ms. Colon-Cosme
16 filed an earlier proof of claim, no. 164805. Ms. Colon-Cosme
17 further states that she received a document in July of 2021
18 that contained a list of plaintiffs on which her name did not
19 appear, and, following receipt of that document,
20 Ms. Colon-Cosme filed the remaining proofs of claim.

21 The original proof of claim, however, was disallowed
22 as deficient on the 155th Omnibus Objection, because it did
23 not provide information sufficient to reconcile the claim.
24 Prior to objecting to the claim as deficient, the debtors sent
25 Ms. Colon-Cosme a mailing seeking additional information

1 regarding the claim, to which Ms. Colon-Cosme did not
2 respond. Ms. Colon-Cosme also did not respond to the 155th
3 Omnibus Objection.

4 To the extent that claims were submitted in an
5 attempt to provide additional information in support of the
6 Colon-Cosme claim -- of the original Colon-Cosme claim,
7 164805, Ms. Colon-Cosme does not provide any explanation as to
8 why that information was not submitted earlier in response to
9 either prior mailing requests or the earlier Omnibus
10 Objection. Ms. Colon-Cosme also does not provide any other
11 basis for the delay in submitting the claims. And for those
12 reasons, we'd request the Court sustain the objection and
13 disallow the claims.

14 THE COURT: Thank you.

15 My ruling is as follows: The 393rd Omnibus Objection
16 is sustained as to Claim Nos. 179470, 179471, and 179472 filed
17 by Janet Colon-Cosme. Those claims are disallowed in their
18 entirety. They were filed more than three years after the bar
19 date, and they were filed well after her original timely
20 claim, 164805, had been disallowed after she failed to respond
21 to requests for information and to respond to the 155th
22 Objection, which objected to that earlier claim as deficient.
23 So that claim was no longer on the books and not able to be
24 modified by these subsequent filings, and the subsequent
25 filings, these three claims, 179470, 179471, and 179472 were

1 filed some three years after the claim deadline.

2 There has been no explanation or justification
3 offered by way of a showing of excusable neglect or other
4 valid reason for the failure to file the claim information,
5 and the claims themselves, timely. Claim Nos. 179470, 179471,
6 and 179472 are disallowed.

7 The next Agenda item is Number VI.14, also in
8 connection with the 393rd Omnibus Objection. This is the
9 response of Carlos Galan-Kercado to that objection.

10 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

11 Mr. Galan-Kercado filed a response at ECF no. 18169,
12 and that response addresses Proof of Claim Nos. 179467,
13 179468, and 179469. Each of those proofs of claim were filed
14 on August 4th, 2021, over three years after the Commonwealth's
15 bar date. Each of those claims also -- well, apologies.
16 Strike that.

17 The response does not dispute that the claims were
18 not timely filed, and, instead, it states that
19 Mr. Galan-Kercado filed an earlier proof of claim, 137467.
20 Mr. Galan-Kercado further states that he received a document
21 in July of 2021 containing a list of plaintiffs on which his
22 name did not appear, and, following receipt of that document,
23 Mr. Galan-Kercado filed the remaining proofs of claim.

24 The original claim filed by Mr. Galan-Kercado was
25 137467, and it was disallowed as deficient on the 127th

1 Omnibus Objection, because it did not provide information
2 sufficient to reconcile the proof of claim. Prior to
3 objecting to the claim as deficient, the debtor sent
4 Mr. Galan-Kercado a mailing seeking additional information
5 regarding the claim, to which he did not respond, and Mr.
6 Galan-Kercado also did not respond to the 127th Omni.

7 To the extent he submitted his following claims in an
8 attempt to provide additional information in support of Claim
9 No. 137467, he did not provide any explanation as to why the
10 information was not submitted in response to either the prior
11 mailing request or the 127th Omni, and Mr. Galan-Kercado
12 provides no other explanation for the delay in submitting the
13 claims. And, for those reasons, we would request the Court
14 disallow the claims, notwithstanding the response.

15 THE COURT: Thank you.

16 My ruling is as follows: The 393rd Omnibus Objection
17 is sustained as to Claim Nos. 179467, 179468, and 179469 filed
18 by Carlos Galan-Kercado. To the extent they are an attempt to
19 supplement or cure deficiencies in Claim No. 137467, they are
20 ineffective in that that earlier claim was disallowed after
21 multiple opportunities to respond to inquiries and an
22 objection as to that claim.

23 There is no valid showing of a reason excusing or
24 justifying the late filing, which is more than three years
25 late, of the claims that are subject to this objection, and

1 they are, therefore, disallowed as late-filed. That is Claim
2 Nos. 179467, 179468, and 179469.

3 We have already addressed the final Agenda item,
4 which is VI.15, and I would ask that the debtors file
5 appropriate proposed orders once the objections have been
6 fully addressed.

7 MS. STAFFORD: (Nodding head up and down.)

8 THE COURT: Ms. Stafford, is there anything further
9 that we should address together this afternoon Puerto Rico
10 time, morning New York time?

11 MS. STAFFORD: I have nothing further, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 Do any other counsel have any issues to raise? If
14 so, raise your hand on the Zoom screen.

15 I see no hands raised on the Zoom screen. Therefore,
16 the Hearing Agenda for this Claim Objection Hearing is
17 concluded. The next scheduled hearing is the March 23rd,
18 2022, Omnibus Hearing, which will be conducted over a
19 combination of Zoom and a listen-only telephone line. An
20 appropriate procedural order for that hearing will be issued
21 in due course.

22 As always, I thank the court staff in Puerto Rico, in
23 Boston, and in New York for their work in preparing and
24 conducting today's hearing, and their ongoing work in support
25 of the administration of these cases under circumstances that

1 remain quite challenging.

2 Thank you, Ms. Stafford, and attending counsel. Stay
3 safe and keep well, everyone. We are adjourned.

4 (At 12:21 PM, proceedings concluded.)

5 * * *

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 U.S. DISTRICT COURT)
2 DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO)

3

4 I certify that this transcript consisting of 90 pages is
5 a true and accurate transcription to the best of my ability of
6 the proceedings in this case before the Honorable United
7 States District Court Judge Laura Taylor Swain, and the
8 Honorable United States Magistrate Judge Judith Gail Dein on
9 February 17, 2022.

10

11

12

13 S/ Amy Walker

14 Amy Walker, CSR 3799

15 Official Court Reporter

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25